arXiv:1411.2955v1 [math.AG] 11 Nov 2014

WEIGHTED COMPACTIFICATIONS OF CONFIGURATION SPACES AND RELATIVE STABLE DEGENERATIONS

EVANGELOS ROUTIS

Abstract. We study a compactification of the configuration space of n distinct labeled points on an arbitrary nonsingular variety. Our construction provides a generalization of the original Fulton-MacPherson compactification that is parallel to the generalization of the moduli space of n-pointed stable curves carried out by Hassett.

1. Introduction

As configurations of points on a projective curve come up naturally in many contexts, moduli spaces $\mathrm{M}_{g,n}$, of smooth n pointed curves of genus g arise naturally as a means by which to study them. While not themselves compact, these varieties do admit a number of compactifications. For example, by the moduli space $\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{g,n}$ of n-pointed stable curves due to Deligne, Mumfurd and Knudsen ([DM69], [KM76],[Knu83a], [Knu83b]), and also by moduli spaces $\overline{M}_{g,\mathcal{A}}$, due to Hassett [Has03], parametrizing weighted configurations of n-pointed stable curves of genus g.

Hassett's weighted spaces receive birational morphisms from $\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{g,n}$, and these maps give useful tools for understanding the spaces $\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{g,n}$. Recently these maps were used to settle a 15 year old question about $\overline{\mathrm{M}}_{0,n}$, about whether or not it is a so-called Mori Dream Space (MDS). A special case of Hassett spaces are known to be toric varieties (the Losev Manin spaces $\overline{LM}_n$) , and as such are MDS. In recent celebrated work, Castravet and Tevelev [CT] prove, that for $n = 134$, the blowup $BL_e\overline{LM}_{134}$ of the Losev Manin Spaces at the identity of its torus, is not a Mori Dream Space, and so consequently as an MDS must map onto an MDS, $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ is not an MDS, for $n \geq 134$.

Such weighted spaces arise in other contexts. Alexeev and Guy ([AG08]) and, independently, Bayer and Manin ([BM09]) introduced the theory of weighted stable maps, extending Kontsevich's theory of ordinary stable maps. Special cases of weighted stable maps also appear in the work of A. Mustaţă and M-A. Mustaţă [MM07].

In this work we introduce and study a nonsingular variety $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$, whose points correspond to stable weighted configurations of points on a smooth variety X. We show that $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ compactifies the configuration space $F(X, n)$, of n distinct labeled points on X, and generalize the Fulton MacPherson spaces $X[n]$. We describe the boundary, showing it is a normal crossings divisor (Theorem 2). Just as with the Hassett spaces, we show that the $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ receive birational morphisms from $X[n]$ consisting of a sequence of blowups (Theorem 5). Our construction generalizes to a relative context, which also gives a relative construction for the original spaces $X[n]$. As a first application, we introduce the moduli space of n *pointed relative* $\mathcal{A}$ *stable degenerations*(Section 3). As

webpage: http://www.math.brown.edu/~r0utis/.

a second application, we provide a presentation of the Chow ring of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$(Theorem 8), which in turn can be used to compute the Chow ring of Hassett's space in genus 0[Rou14].

Contents

1. Introduction 1
1.1. Precise statement of results 2
2. A weighted stable compactification 6
2.1. Building sets and Wonderful Compactifications 7
2.2. Weighted compactification of configuration spaces 9
2.3. The universal family 15
2.4. Functorial Description 22
2.5. Reduction and Forgetful morphisms 25
3. Relative stable degenerations 27
3.1. The relative weighted compactification 27
3.2. Relative weighted stable degenerations 35
4. Examples of weighted compactifications 37
4.1. Weighted stable maps of degree one to $\mathbb{P}^1$ 37
5. The Chow ring of the weighted compactification 38
References 48

1.1. **Precise statement of results.** Let X be a nonsingular variety over an algebraically closed field k and $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}$ be a set of rational numbers such that

- $0 < a_i \leq 1, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$

The aim of this paper is to introduce and study the so called *weighted compactification* $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ of the configuration space $F_{\mathcal{A}}(X, n)$ of n labeled points in X carrying weights a_i, that is the parameter space of ordered n-tuples of points equipped with weights a_i that satisfy the condition:

- for any set of labels $S \subset N$ of coincident points we have $\sum_{i \in S} a_i \leq 1$.

The resulting space is a generalization of the Fulton Macpherson compactification ([FM94]) and also provides a compactification of the configuration space of n *distinct* labeled points. The main definitions and properties are found in sections 2.2 and 2.3. Let

$$\mathcal{G} := \{\Delta_{12\ldots n}; \Delta_{12\ldots(n-1)}, \ldots, \Delta_{23\ldots n}; \ldots; \Delta_{12}, \ldots, \Delta_{(n-1)n}\}$$

be the set of diagonals of X^n listed in ascending dimension order.

Also, let $N := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and set

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} := \{\Delta_S \subset X^n | S \subset N \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} a_i > 1\}$$

and list its elements in ascending dimension order.

Definition: The *weighted compactification* $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ of the configuration space $F_{\mathcal{A}}(X,n)$ is the closure of the image of the diagonal embedding

$$X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n \times \prod_{\Delta_I \in \ \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} Bl_{\Delta_I} X^n$$

Main Theorem:(Section 2.2, Theorem 2)

(1) $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is a nonsingular variety. The boundary $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \setminus (X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I)$ is the union of $|\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}|$ divisors D_I, where $I \subset N, |I| \geq 2$ and $\sum_{i \in I} a_i > 1$.

(2) Any set of the boundary divisors intersects transversally. An intersection of divisors $D_{I_1} \cap D_{I_2} \cap \ldots D_{I_k}$ is nonempty precisely when the sets are nested in the sense that any pair $\{I_i, I_j\}$ either has empty intersection or one set is contained in the other.

(3) $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is the iterated blowup of X^n along dominant transforms of the diagonals of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in the above order.

Note: The *dominant transform* of a variety under a blowup is either the strict transform, in case the variety is not contained in the center of the blowup, or the inverse image of the variety via the blowup map if it is contained in the center.

We further introduce the *universal family* $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$, in section 2.3. This is a flat morphism between nonsingular varieties equipped with n sections in its smooth locus (cf Theorem 3). Its fibers, called *n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations*, are described in section 2.2. These look like the degenerations that one sees in the Fulton Macpherson compactification, with the exception that the sections now carry weights and are allowed to collide depending on the accumulation of their weights. We also provide a functorial description of the weighted compactification in section 2.4 in analogy with the one in [FM94]. Forgetful and reduction morphisms analogous to the ones in [Has03], [BM09], [AG08] are introduced in section 2.5.

In [FM94], Fulton and Macpherson state that one should be able to extend their results by providing a compactification of the configuration space of n distinct labeled points on the fibers of a smooth family $X \to Y$. Pandharipande ([Pan95]) shows that this is possible under the additional condition that the morphism $X \to Y$ is projective. We show that the Fulton-Macpherson construction can be lifted to the relative case without the projectivity assumption and more generally, that there exists a moduli space $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ that parametrizes n pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations on the fibers of $X \to Y$. We call the latter the *relative weighted compactification* (Section 3.1). As expected, the properties described in Section 2 regarding the absolute case $X \to k$ carry over to the relative setting (see Section 3.1 for a discussion). As an application, we construct the moduli space of n-pointed relative $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations and its universal family (section 3.2): let W be a smooth variety and B a smooth curve with a

distinguished point $b_0 \in B$. Also, let $\pi : W \to B$ be a flat morphism such that the fibers W_b are smooth for all $b \in B$ except $b = b_0$, in which case W_{b_0} is the union of two smooth varieties X_1 and X_2 intersecting transversally along a smooth divisor D. This implies that $N_{D/X_1} \cong N_{D/X_2}^{\vee}$. We have the following :

Definition ([ACFW11, Definition 2.3.1]): The *expansion of length* $l \geq 0$ of W_{b_0} is the variety

$$W(l) := X_1 \bigsqcup_{D=D_1^-} P_1 \bigsqcup_{D_1^+=D_2^-} \cdots \bigsqcup_{D_{l-1}^+=D_l^-} P_l \bigsqcup_{D_{l+}^+=D} X_2$$

where the P_i are isomorphic to the $\mathbb{P}^1$- bundle $\mathbb{P}(N_{D/X_1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_D) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_D \oplus N_{D/X_2})$ and D_j^-, D_j^+ are the zero and infinity sections of P_j respectively. The P_j are called the exceptional components of the expansion.

In [AF13], the authors construct a compactification of the space of n tuples of points on the fibers of π such that the points are not allowed to land in the singular locus, by replacing the critical fibers is by expansions. We give the basic definitions and refer the reader to [ibid.] for more details.

Definition([AF13, Definition 1.2.1]): A *stable expanded configuration* $(\mathcal{W}, \widetilde{\sigma_i})$ of degree n on $\pi : W \to B$ consists of:

(1) either a smooth fiber W_b or an expansion of W_{b_0}, which we denote by $\mathcal{W}$
(2) an ordered collection of n smooth points $\widetilde{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{W}^{sm}$, $i = 1, \dots n$

such that in case $\mathcal{W}$ is an expansion, the following stability condition holds:

- each exceptional component P_j contains at least one of the $\widetilde{\sigma_i}$.

Let $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be a set of rational numbers as above.

Definition: An *n-pointed relative* $\mathcal{A}$ *stable degeneration* of $W \to B$ is pair $(\mathcal{W}', \sigma_i')$ such that

$$W' = \mathcal{W} \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{W}^{sm} \setminus \{\sigma_i\}} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$$

where $(\mathcal{W}, \sigma_i)$ is a stable expanded configuration of degree n and $(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}, \sigma_i')$ is an n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration of $(\mathcal{W}^{sm}, \sigma_i)$ in the sense of section 2.2.

The moduli space that parametrizes such objects is discussed in section 3.2. The motivation for introducing such degenerations is the construction of the moduli space of *relative (un)ramified stable maps*, that is maps from curves to n pointed relative stable degenerations (with all weights equal to 1). This is the relative version of the moduli space of (un)ramified stable maps [KKO14], which in turn generalizes the moduli space of admissible covers ([HM82], [ACV03]), by allowing target degenerations to be the Fulton Macpherson degenerations. This project will be carried out elsewhere.

In section 4, we provide some further relevant examples from the literature and show how they relate to our construction.

One the advantages of working with nonsingular spaces is that one often has enough tools to determine their intersection theory. The blowup presentation of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is an asset that makes things simpler. By making use of the explicit geometry of the strict transforms of the diagonals in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in each blowup stage, as demonstrated in detail in Section 5, and by successively applying Keel's blowup formula ([Kee92]), we conclude the complete description of the Chow ring of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$. We assume that X has a *cellular decomposition*, i.e. there exists a filtration

$$X_n := X \supset X_{n-1} \supset \dots X_0 \supset X_{-1} := \emptyset$$

such that each $X_i \setminus X_{i-1}$ is isomorphic to a disjoint union of affine spaces. The reason we make this assumption is that in this case there exists a natural isomorphism $A^\bullet(X^n) \cong (A^\bullet X)^{\otimes n}$.

Now, let $S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. The restriction morphism $A^\bullet X^n \to A^\bullet \Delta_S$ is surjective. Define

$$J_S := ker(A^\bullet X^n \to A^\bullet \Delta_S)$$

By our assumptions, X^n has a Künneth decomposition, so we have

$$J_S = (p_a^* x - p_b^* x)_{x \in A^\bullet X,\, a,b \in S}$$

where $p_a : X^n \to X$ is the projection onto the a-th factor. Also, define the polynomial $c_{a,b}(t) \in A^\bullet(X^n)[t]$ by

$$c_{a,b}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i p_a^*(c_{m-i}) t^i + [\Delta_{\{a,b\}}]$$

where $m = dim(X)$ and c_{m-i} is the $(m-i)$th Chern class of the tangent bundle T_X of X. We give the following:

Definition:

(1) Let $S, T \subset N$ such that $|S|, |T| \geq 2$. We say that S and T **overlap** if S and T have nonempty intersection and neither of them is contained in the other. In this case we also say that T is an **overlap** of S and vice versa.
(2) Let $S, T \subset N$ such that $|S|, |T| \geq 2$. We say that T is a **weak overlap** of S (and vice versa) if the intersection of S and T is a singleton.

Remark: In the above definition we do not require Δ_S or Δ_T to be in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

We are now ready to state the other main result of this paper: let $A^\bullet(X^n)[D^S]$ be the polynomial ring over $A^\bullet(X^n)$ in the variables D^S, where $S \subset N$ is such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

This polynomial ring maps to the Chow ring of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ by sending each D^S to the class of the divisor D_S of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$.

Main Theorem 2 (Section 5, Theorem 8):With the above assumptions and notation, the Chow ring of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is the quotient

$$\frac{A^\bullet(X^n)[D^S]}{\mathcal{I}}$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is the ideal generated by the following elements:

- $D^S \cdot D^T$, for any S and T that overlap and both Δ_S and Δ_T belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$;
- $J_S \cdot D^S$, where $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$;
- $D^S \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{|T|-1} c_{i_k,i_{k+1}} \left(\sum_{I \supseteq S \cup T} D^I \right)$, where $T = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{|T|}\}$ is a weak overlap of S, $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and Δ_T is not necessarily in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$;
- $\prod_{k=1}^{|S|-1} c_{i_k,i_{k+1}} \left(\sum_{I \supseteq S} D^I \right)$, where $S = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{|S|}\}$ and $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

In [Rou14] we use the results of this last section to compute the Chow ring of Hassett's space in genus 0 [Has03]. The advantage of this approach is that it avoids all GIT constructions of the moduli space of weighted stable curves as presented for example in [KM11] and [GJM13]. The construction of Kiem and Moon is given via a sequence of blowups starting from $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n /\!\!/ SL_2$ and exhibits $\overline{M}_{0,\mathcal{A}}$ as a GIT quotient of the moduli space of parametrized rational stable curves ([MM07]) by SL_2 for special cases of $\mathcal{A}$. However, the blowup centers are not always smooth. In fact, when n is even the above sequence involves Kirwan's blowup desingularization.

Conventions: Throughout this paper we will be using the term 'ascending dimension order' when we list the elements of an arrangement of subvarieties of a fixed variety. By this we will understand that if $X_1 \subset X_2$ as sets then $X_1 < X_2$ i.e. it is a partial order condition with respect to inclusion. We will also often write N in place of the set $\{1, 2 \dots, n\}$.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to my advisor, Dan Abramovich, for suggesting this project to me, for numerous conversations and for his constant encouragement to complete it. I would also like to express my gratitude to Angela Gibney and Danny Krashen for their assistance and valuable advice. Finally, I would like to thank Brendan Hassett, Noah Giansiracusa, Qile Chen, Dawei Chen and Sam Molcho for discussing this work and for providing useful comments.

2. A weighted stable compactification

Throughout this section we will understand the term variety as an integral variety over an algebraically closed field k.

2.1. **Building sets and Wonderful Compactifications.** In this section we recall some definitions and results from [Li09].

Definition 1. *A **simple arrangement** of subvarieties of a nonsingular variety Y is a finite set $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}$ of nonsingular closed subvarieties S_i properly contained in Y satisfying the following conditions:*

(i) $T(S_i \cap S_j) = TS_i|_{S_i \cap S_j} \cap TS_j|_{S_i \cap S_j}$ and
(ii) $S_i \cap S_j$ is either equal to some $S_k \in \mathcal{S}$ or empty.

If the smooth varieties S_i and S_j satisfy condition(i) above, we say that S_i and S_j intersect **cleanly**.

Definition 2. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an arrangement of subvarieties of Y. A subset $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{S}$ is called a **building set** of $\mathcal{S}$ if for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, the minimal elements of $\mathcal{G}$ containing S intersect transversally and their intersection is equal to S (by convention, the condition is satisfied if $S \in \mathcal{G}$). These minimal elements are called the $\mathcal{G}$-factors of S.*
A finite set $\mathcal{G}$ of nonsingular subvarieties of Y is called a building set if the set of all possible intersections forms an arrangement $\mathcal{S}$ and if, in addition, $\mathcal{G}$ is a buiding set of $\mathcal{S}$. In this case, $\mathcal{S}$ is called the arrangement induced by $\mathcal{G}$.

For example, let X be a nonsingular variety. The set $\mathcal{G} = \{\Delta_{12}, \Delta_{13}\}$ of diagonals in X^3 is a building set whose induced simple arrangement is the set $\{\Delta_{12}, \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{123}\}$. On the other hand, $\{\Delta_{12}, \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{23}\}$ is not a buiding set; the set of all possible intersections is $\{\Delta_{12}, \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{123}\}$, yet Δ_{123} is not the transversal intersection of Δ_{12}, Δ_{13} and Δ_{23}.

Definition 3. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a building set and set $Y^o := Y \setminus \bigcup_{G \in \mathcal{G}} G$. The closure of the image of the locally closed (diagonal) embedding*

$$Y^o \hookrightarrow Y \times \prod_{G \in \mathcal{G}} Bl_G Y$$

is called the wonderful compactification of Y with respect to $\mathcal{G}$ and is denoted by $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$.

In the sequel, we will frequently make use of the following:

Definition 4. *The **dominant transform** of a variety under a blowup is either the strict transform, in case the variety is not contained in the center or the blowup, or the inverse image of the variety via the blowup map if it is contained in the center.*

The following theorem ([Li09]) will be useful for our construction:

Theorem 1. *Let Y be a nonsingular variety and $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_N\}$ be a building set of subvarieties of Y. Then,*

(1) the wonderful compactification $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a nonsingular variety. Moreover, for each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ there is a nonsingular divisor $D_G \subset Y_{\mathcal{G}}$, such that
(a) The union of the divisors is $Y_{\mathcal{G}} \setminus Y^o$

(b) *Any set of these divisors meet transversally. An intesection of divisors* $D_{T_1} \cap \cdots \cap D_{T_r}$ *is nonempty precisely when* $\{T_1, \ldots, T_r\}$ *is a nest.*

(2) *if we arrange* $\mathcal{G}$ *in such an order that the first* i *terms* $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_i$ *form a building set for all* $1 \leq i \leq N$*, then*

$$Y_{\mathcal{G}} = Bl_{\widetilde{G}_N} \cdots Bl_{\widetilde{G}_2} Bl_{G_1} Y$$

where $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$ *is the wonderful compactification of* Y *with respect to* $\mathcal{G}$ *and the* $\widetilde{\ }$ *sign on top of each* G_i *stands for the iterated dominant transform of the latter in the corresponding blowup.*

(3) *let* I_i *be the ideal sheaf of* G_i*. Then, the wonderful compactification* $Y_{\mathcal{G}}$ *is equal to the blowup of* Y *along the ideal sheaf* $I_1 I_2 \ldots I_N$*,*

$$Y_{\mathcal{G}} \cong Bl_{I_N} \ldots Bl_{I_2} Bl_{I_1} Y \cong Bl_{I_1 I_2 \ldots I_N} Y$$

Remark: The divisors D_G are the iterated dominant transforms of the G_i under the blowup $Y_{\mathcal{G}} \to Y$.

The Fulton-Macpherson compactification [FM94] is an example of a wonderful compactification as we see in the following example:

Example 1. *The Fulton-Macpherson configuration space*

Consider the configuration space of n distinct labeled points in a nonsingular variety X. It is equal to the complement of all diagonals in X^n,

$$F(X, n) := X^n \setminus \bigcup_{|I| \geq 2} \Delta_I$$

In [FM94], the compactification of $F(X, n)$, $X[n]$, is constructed inductively as a sequence of blowups. More specifically, $X[1] = X$ and $X[2]$ is the blowup of X^2 along the diagonal Δ_{12}. Then $X[3]$ is constructed from $X[2] \times X$ in three steps: First, the exceptional divisor D of $X[2]$ is embedded as a graph of the map from D to X in $X[2] \times X$; the embedded subvariety maps down to Δ_{123} in X^3. Also note that $X[2]$ can be embedded in $X[2] \times X$ in two ways as a graph of the projections from $X[2]$ to X; the embedded subvarieties map down to Δ_{13}, Δ_{23} in X^3. To get $X[3]$ one then needs to blow up along D; this gives (the universal family) $X[2]^+$. Then one blows up along the strict transforms of $X[2]$ (embedded as above) which have become disjoint so the order doesn't matter. To get $X[4]$ one then starts over with $X[3] \times X$ by blowing up a subvariety which maps down to Δ_{1234}, etc. In general, to get $X[n]$ one blows up along subvarieties corresponding to all diagonals in the following order

$$\Delta_{12}; \Delta_{123}; \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{23}; \Delta_{1234}; \Delta_{124}, \Delta_{134}, \Delta_{234}; \Delta_{14}, \Delta_{24}, \Delta_{34}; \ldots$$

or equivalently $X[n]$ is obtained as a sequence of blow ups along dominant transforms of the above diagonals in the above order. The above sequence satisfies the hypotheses

of Theorem 1; for this fact, see the proof of Theorem 4 below. We therefore conclude that $X[n]$ is the wonderful compactification $X^n_{\mathcal{G}}$ of X^n with respect to the building set $\mathcal{G}$ of all diagonals. This recovers [FM94, Proposition 4.1].

Moreover, theorem 1 implies that $X[n]$ can also be obtained by the following symmetric sequence of blowups along dominant transforms of diagonals in ascending dimension

$$\Delta_{12\ldots n}; \Delta_{12\ldots(n-1)}, \ldots, \Delta_{23\ldots n}; \ldots, \Delta_{12}, \ldots, \Delta_{(n-1)n}$$

For more details see the proof of Lemma 1 below.

2.2. **Weighted compactification of configuration spaces.** In [FM94], the authors describe a natural and beautiful way of compactifying the configuration space of n distinct labeled points in a nonsingular variety X. The degenerate objects of the resulting compactification consist of varieties with n points that remain distinct. In this section we introduce an alternate compactification of this configuration space, by equipping points with weights and allowing them to collide in the degenerations depending on the accumulation of their weights.

2.2.1. *n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations.* We now give a geometric description of the degenerate objects of our compactification(see also [FM94],[Pan95]). Let X be a nonsingular variety over an algebraically closed field k and $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}$ be a set of rational numbers such that

- $0 < a_i \leq 1, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$

Let $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ be an ordered n-tuple of points of X carrying weights a_i. A subset $S \subset N$ is said to be *coincident* at $x \in X$ if

- $|S| \geq 2$,
- $\sum_{i \in S} a_i > 1$ and
- for all $i \in S$, $x_i = x$

A *screen* of S at x consists of the data $(t_i)_{i \in S}$ such that:

(1) $t_i \in T_x$, the tangent space of X at x
(2) there exist $i, j \in S$ such that $t_i \neq t_j$

Two data sets $(t_i)_{i \in S}$ and $(t'_i)_{i \in S}$ are equivalent if there exist $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $v \in T_x$ s.t. $c \cdot t_i + v = t'_i$ for all $i \in S$. Now, consider the n-tuple $(x_1, x_2, \ldots x_n)$ together with the collection of all coincident sets S. We construct the (weighted) n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration of X as follows. Let z be a coordinate that occurs multiple times in $(x_1, \ldots x_n)$ and generates a coincident set at z. We blow up X at z and attach the projective completion $\mathbb{P}(T_z \oplus 1)$ along the exceptional divisor $\mathbb{P}(T_z)$, which is identified with the infinity section. Note that the complement $\mathbb{P}(T_z \oplus 1) \setminus \mathbb{P}(T_z)$ is isomorphic to the affine space T_z. Let S_z be the maximal coincident subset at z. The screen corresponding to S_z associates points of T_z to the indices that lie in S_z. By condition (2) for

screens, we see that some separation of those points occurs. We continue this process by blowing up points in the new spaces T_z specified by the subsequent screens until all screens have been used, for all such coordinates z. The resulting variety is equipped with n points s_i lying in the smooth locus. By this description we see that if $S \subset N$ and $\sum_{i\in S} a_i > 1$ then some separation of the sections $(s_i)_{i\in S}$ necessarily occurs. This means that if the sections $(s_i)_{i\in S}$ all coincide for some S, then $\sum_{i\in S} a_i \leq 1$.

To any $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration we associate a tree whose vertices correspond one to one to its components and whose vertices correspond one to one to the intersections of its components. There exists a distinguished component called the *root*, which is a blowup of X at a finite set of points. We call a component an *end* if it is not the root and the valence of its vertex is equal to 1. A ruled component is one whose vertex has valence 2. End components come with at least three distinct markings: at least two coming from distinct smooth sections and one (node) from an intersection with another component. Ruled components also come with three distinct markings: at least one from a smooth section and two from intersections with other components (nodes). In other words all components, except for the root, come with at least three distinct markings, so there are no nontrivial automorphisms of an n- pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration preserving the root. This justifies the term *stability*.

2.2.2. *The weighted compactification.* Let

$$\mathcal{G} := \{\Delta_{12\dots n}; \Delta_{12\dots(n-1)}, \dots, \Delta_{23\dots n}; \dots; \Delta_{12}, \dots, \Delta_{(n-1)n}\}$$

be the set of diagonals of X^n listed in ascending dimension order.

Also, let

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} := \{\Delta_S \subset X^n | S \subset N \text{ and } \sum_{i\in S} a_i > 1\}$$

and list its elements in ascending dimension order.

Lemma 1. *$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the condition of Theorem 1 (2). In particular, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a building set.*

Proof: Consider the set of the first i elements, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},i}$. Pick an arbitrary subset of k elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},i}$, say $\{\Delta_{I_1}, \Delta_{I_2}, \dots, \Delta_{I_k}\}$ and consider the intersection $S_k := \Delta_{I_1} \cap \Delta_{I_2} \cap \dots \cap \Delta_{I_k}$, i.e. an element of the simple arrangement induced by $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},i}$. We need to show that the minimal elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},i}$ that contain S_k intersect transversally along S_k. Observe that the above intersection can be written uniquely as $\Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \cdots \cap \Delta_{J_{k'}}$, where $k' \leq k$ and for $j = 1, \dots k'$, the indices J_j are unions of some of the I_l and also pairwise disjoint. Indeed, we start with I_1; if I_1 is disjoint from the union $I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_k$, we set $J_1 := I_1$. Otherwise, we pick the first element (index) in the collection of indices $\{I_1, I_2, \dots I_k\} \setminus \{I_1\} = \{I_2, \dots I_k\}$ that is not disjoint (as a set) from I_1 and we call this I_{t_1}. Then we pick the first element in the collection $\{I_1, I_2, \dots I_k\} \setminus \{I_1, I_{t_1}\}$

that is not disjoint (as a set) from the union $I_1 \cup I_{t_1}$ and we carry on until we have chosen $I_1, I_{t_1}, \dots I_{t_l}$ such that all elements of the set $\{I_1, I_2, \dots I_k\} \setminus \{I_1, I_{t_1}, \dots I_{t_l}\}$ are disjoint from the union $I_1 \cup I_{t_1} \cup \dots \cup I_{t_l}$. We set $J_1 := I_1 \cup I_{t_1} \cup \dots \cup I_{t_l}$. Of course, $\Delta_{J_1} = \Delta_{I_1} \cap \Delta_{I_{t_1}} \dots \cap \Delta_{I_{t_l}}$. Next, to obtain J_2, we repeat the same procedure for the first index among $\{I_1, I_2, \dots I_k\} \setminus \{I_1, I_{t_1}, \dots I_{t_l}\}$, etc. and we continue until all elements of the set $\{I_1, I_2, \dots I_k\}$ have been exhausted. At the end of the procedure we will obtain indices J_i, $i = 1, \dots k'$, where $k' \leq k$ with the property that $S_k := \Delta_{I_1} \cap \Delta_{I_2} \dots \cap \Delta_{I_k} = \Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \dots \cap \Delta_{J_{k'}}$. Since the J_i are pairwise disjoint, it is clear that this expression is unique.

Observe that $\Delta_{J_j} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},i}$ for all $j = 1, \dots k'$: indeed, for each j, the index set J_j contains some $I_l, l \in \{1, 2, \dots k\}$, so

$$\sum_{i \in J_j} a_i \geq \sum_{i \in I_l} a_i > 1$$

Therefore, the minimal elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},i}$ that contain $S_k = \Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \dots \cap \Delta_{J_{k'}}$ are precisely the elements $\Delta_{J_1}, \Delta_{J_2}, \dots \Delta_{J_{k'}}$, which are seen to intersect transversally, since the J_i are disjoint. □

Definition 5. *The weighted configuration space with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ is the complement of the union of the diagonals that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in X^n*

$$F_{\mathcal{A}}(X, n) := X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \ .$$

The weighted configuration space may be viewed as the parameter space of n labeled points in X carrying weights a_i subject to the following condition:

- for any set of labels $S \subset N$ of coincident points we have $\sum_{i \in S} a_i \leq 1$.

We are now ready to define its weighted compactification:

Definition 6. *The weighted compactification of the configuration space $F_{\mathcal{A}}(X, n)$ is the wonderful compactification of X^n with respect to the building set $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, that is the closure of the image of the diagonal embedding*

$$X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n \times \prod_{\Delta_I \in \ \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} Bl_{\Delta_I} X^n$$

We denote the weighted compactification by $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$.

Remark: $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is empty if $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \leq 1$. In this case $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is trivially equal to X^n.

Remark: The variety $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is also a compactification of the configuration space of n *distinct* labeled points $F(X,n) = X^n \setminus \bigcup_{|I|\geq 2} \Delta_I$, since the latter is an open subset of $X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I$, so the closure of

$$X^n \setminus \bigcup_{|I|\geq 2} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n \times \prod_{\Delta_I \in\ \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} Bl_{\Delta_I} X^n$$

is the same as the closure of

$$X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n \times \prod_{\Delta_I \in\ \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} Bl_{\Delta_I} X^n$$

For this reason we can consider it a generalization of the original Fulton-Macpherson compactification.

The variety $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ enjoys the following nice properties:

Theorem 2. *(1) $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is a nonsingular variety. The boundary $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \setminus (X^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I)$ is the union of $|\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}|$ divisors D_I, where $I \subset N, |I| \geq 2$ and $\sum_{i\in I} a_i > 1$.*

(2) Any set of boundary divisors intersects transversally. An intersection of divisors $D_{I_1} \cap D_{I_2} \cap \ldots D_{I_k}$ is nonempty precisely when the sets are nested in the sense that any pair $\{I_i, I_j\}$ either has empty intersection or one set is contained in the other.

(3) $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is the iterated blowup of X^n along dominant transforms of elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof: This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and Lemma 1. In part (3), in particular, the order of the blowups agrees with the order we wrote down the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. □

The following basic lemma will be useful for the proofs of the results that appear in the sequel.

Lemma 2. *Let Z be a smooth subvariety of a smooth variety Y and let $\pi : Bl_Z Y \to Y$ be the blowup, with exceptional divisor $E = \pi^{-1}(Z)$.*

(1) Let V be a smooth subvariety of Y, not contained in Z, and let $\widetilde{V} \subset Bl_Z Y$ be its strict transform. Then,

(a) if V meets Z transversally (or is disjoint from Z), then $\widetilde{V} = \pi^{-1}(V)$ maps isomorphically to V and $I_{\pi^{-1}(V)} = I_{\widetilde{V}}$.

(b) if $V \supset Z$, then $I_{\pi^{-1}(V)} = I_{\widetilde{V}} \cdot I_E$. If Z has codimension 1 in V, then the projection from $\widetilde{V}$ to V is an isomorphism.

(2) *If Z_i are smooth subvarieties of Y such that $\sum I_{Z_i} = I_Z$, where I_{Z_i} (resp. I_Z) are the ideal sheaves of Z_i (resp. Z), then the strict transforms of the Z_i in $Bl_Z Y$ do not intersect simultaneously.*

(3) *Let Z_1, Z_2 be smooth subvarieties of Y intersecting transversally.*

(a) *Assume $Z_1 \cap Z_2 \supsetneq Z$. Then their strict transforms $\widetilde{Z_1}$ and $\widetilde{Z_2}$ intersect transversally and $\widetilde{Z_1} \cap \widetilde{Z_2} = \widetilde{Z_1 \cap Z_2}$.*

(b) *Assume Z intersects transversally with Z_1 and Z_2, as well as with their intersection $Z_1 \cap Z_2$. Then their strict transforms $\widetilde{Z_1}$ and $\widetilde{Z_2}$ intersect transversally and $\widetilde{Z_1} \cap \widetilde{Z_2} = \widetilde{Z_1 \cap Z_2}$.*

(c) *If $Z_1 \supseteq Z$ and Z_2 intersects transversally with Z, then the intersections*

$$\widetilde{Z_1} \cap \widetilde{Z_2} \text{ and } (E \cap \widetilde{Z_1}) \cap \widetilde{Z_2}$$

are transversal. Moreover, $\widetilde{Z_1} \cap \widetilde{Z_2} = \widetilde{Z_1 \cap Z_2}$.

(4) *Let W be a smooth subvariety of Y that intersects transversally with Z. Then,*

$$Bl_{\widetilde{W}} Bl_Z Y = Bl_{\widetilde{Z}} Bl_W Y$$

Proof: (1) is the content of [FM94, Lemma 4.1(a),(b)], (2) and (4) are standard, while (3) is essentially the content of [Li09, Lemma 2.9,(iii), (iv) and (v)]. □

Proposition 1. *Let $\pi : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X^S$ be the composition of the blowup map (see theorem 2(3)) $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X^n$ with the projection $X^n \to X^S$ onto the coordinates labeled by S for some $S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then,*

$$I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_S} = \prod_{T \supset S} I_{D_T}$$

where Δ_S is the small diagonal in X^S.

Proof:We extend the partial order of the set of indices of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to a total order which respects inclusions of diagonals:

$$I_0 := (12 \dots n) < I_1 < \dots < I_{|\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}|-1}$$

Define $X_0 := Bl_{\Delta_{I_0}} X^n$ and let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_0)} := \{\Delta_{I_0}{}^{(I_0)}, \Delta_{I_1}{}^{(I_0)}, \dots \Delta_{I_l}{}^{(I_0)}, \dots, \Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_0)}, \dots\}$ be the set of dominant transforms of the varieties(diagonals) that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in X_0. Then define $X_1 := Bl_{\Delta_{I_1}{}^{(I_0)}} X_0$ and let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_1)} := \{\Delta_{I_0}{}^{(I_1)}, \Delta_{I_1}{}^{(I_1)} \dots \Delta_{I_l}{}^{(I_1)}, \dots, \Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_1)}, \dots\}$ be the set of dominant transforms of the varieties that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_0)}$ in X_1. For $k \geq 2$, we may define inductively the I_k-th iterated blowup,

$$X_k := Bl_{\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_{k-1})}} X_{k-1} = Bl_{\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_{k-1})}} \dots Bl_{\Delta_{I_0}} X^n$$

and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_k)} := \{\Delta_{I_0}^{(I_k)}; \dots \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_k)}, \dots, \Delta_{I_k}^{(I_k)}, \dots\}$ as the set of dominant transforms of the subvarieties of X_{k-1} that are the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_{k-1})}$. In other words, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_k)} := \{\Delta_{I_0}^{(I_k)}, \dots \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_k)}, \dots, \Delta_{I_k}^{(I_k)}, \dots\}$ is the set of the I_k-th iterated dominant transforms of the diagonals of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in X_k.

Then, by [Li09, Remark after Definition 2.12], we deduce that each $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_k)}$ is a building set.

Let k be such that $I_k = S$. We prove the following claim by induction :

Claim: Let $\pi_{j+1,j} : X_{j+1} \to X_j$ and $\pi_j : X_j \to X^n$ be the natural blowup maps. Then, for any j,

$$I_{\pi_j^{-1}(\Delta_{I_k})} = I_{\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_j)}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{l \leq j \\ I_l \supsetneq I_k}} I_{\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)}}$$

Proof: Let $j = 0$. If $k = 0$ there's nothing to prove. Otherwise, $\Delta_{I_k} \supsetneq \Delta_{I_0}$, so by Lemma 2, we have

$$I_{\pi_0^{-1}(\Delta_{I_k})} = I_{\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_0)}} \cdot I_{\Delta_{I_0}^{(I_0)}}$$

Now assume the claim is true for j. By pulling back to X_{j+1} via $\pi_{j+1,j} : X_{j+1} \to X_j$, we obtain

$$I_{\pi_{j+1}^{-1}(\Delta_{I_k})} = I_{\pi_{j+1,j}^{-1}(\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_j)})} \cdot \prod_{\substack{l \leq j \\ I_l \supsetneq I_k}} I_{\pi_{j+1,j}^{-1}(\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)})} \tag{1}$$

Observe that each of the terms $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)}$ are divisors so they cannot be contained in the center $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)}$ due to dimension reasons (note $l < j+1$). Therefore, the center is minimal in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_j)}$, so by [Li09, Lemma 2.6(i)], the above terms must be transversal to the center, hence, by Lemma 2(1)

$$I_{\pi_{j+1,j}^{-1}(\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)})} = I_{\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}} \tag{2}$$

Moreover, again by using Lemma 2 we get

$$I_{\pi_{j+1,j}^{-1}(\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_j)})} = \begin{cases} I_{\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_{j+1})}} \cdot I_{\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})}} & \text{, if } I_{j+1} \supsetneq I_k \\ I_{\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_{j+1})}} & \text{, otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Plugging (2) and (3) into (1), we obtain

$$I_{\pi_{j+1}^{-1}(\Delta_{I_k})} = \begin{cases} I_{\Delta_{I_k}(I_{j+1})} \cdot I_{\Delta_{I_{j+1}}(I_{j+1})} \cdot \prod_{\substack{l\leq j \\ I_l \supsetneq I_k}} I_{\Delta_{I_l}(I_{j+1})} & \text{, if } I_{j+1} \supsetneq I_k \\ I_{\Delta_{I_k}(I_{j+1})} \cdot \prod_{\substack{l\leq j \\ I_l \supsetneq I_k}} I_{\Delta_{I_l}(I_{j+1})} & \text{, otherwise} \end{cases}$$

In both cases, we have $I_{\pi_{j+1}^{-1}(\Delta_{I_k})} = I_{\Delta_{I_k}(I_{j+1})} \cdot \prod_{\substack{l\leq j+1 \\ I_l \supsetneq I_k}} I_{\Delta_{I_l}(I_{j+1})}$, so we conclude the claim for $j+1$.

By the remark after Theorem 1, the divisors D_T in $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ are the iterated dominant transforms of $\Delta_T \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ under the sequence of blowups $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X^n$. By taking j such that I_j is the greatest index (with the above total order) in the set of indices of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, in other words $I_j = I_{|\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}|-1}$, and applying the claim we conclude the proposition. □

Remark: It does not matter which total order we choose, as long as it respects the dimension order of the diagonals; in this case $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the condition of Theorem 1(2) (as in lemma 1), so the resulting blowup is independent of the ordering.

Remark: The above Proposition is the analogue of [FM94, Theorem 3(3)].

Remark: In case $a_i = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the moduli space $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ coincides with the Fulton Macpherson compactification. In general, the weighted moduli space enjoys more properties analogous to those of the original Fulton Macpherson space [FM94], as we shall see in the following sections.

2.3. **The universal family.** The content of this section is summarized in the following Theorem:

Theorem 3. *There exists a 'universal' family $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ equipped with n sections $\sigma_i : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+, i = 1, \ldots n$. It is a flat morphism between nonsingular varieties, whose fibers are n pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations of X.*

The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of the above theorem. We first construct the universal family as a sequence of blowups and define auxiliary spaces. The proof is broken into various steps. We also prove various facts about the geometry of the intersections of the subvarieties involved in each blowup.

Consider the product $Y_0 := X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$. For any $I \subset N$, let $I_+ \subset N_+ := \{1, 2, \ldots, n+1\}$ be the set $I \cup \{n+1\}$. We define various subvarieties of Y_0. First, consider the divisors D_I of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$, i.e. the iterated dominant transforms of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ under the

sequence of blowups $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X^n$. Those map to Δ_I via $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X^n \to X^I$, where the second map is the projection onto the coordinates labeled by I.

- With Δ_I identified with $X \subset X^I$, we embed each D_I in $Y_0 := X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$ as the graph of the map $D_I \to X$. The image of this embedding is defined to be $D_{I+}^{(Y_0)}$.
- We define $D_I{}^{(Y_0)} := D_I \times X$.
- For each $i \in N$ we define $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)}$ to be the embedding of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ in $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$ given by the graph of the morphism $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X^n \xrightarrow{p_i} X$, where p_i is the projection to the i-th factor.

Define Y_1 to be the blowup of Y_0 along $D_{N+}^{(Y_0)}$. Assume Y_k is defined. We will call the variety Y_k the **k-th step**. Then we define Y_{k+1} to be the blowup of Y_k along the disjoint union of the subvarieties $D_{I+}^{(Y_k)}$, where $|I| = n - k$ and $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$; those subvarieties will be shown to be disjoint in the following Propositions. For any $I, I_+ \subset N_+$ s.t $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ we define the subvarieties $D_I^{(Y_{k+1})}$ and $D_{I+}^{(Y_{k+1})}$ of Y_{k+1} to be the dominant transforms of the subvarieties $D_I^{(Y_k)}$ and $D_{I+}^{(Y_k)}$ respectively of Y_k. We do the same for $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_{k+1})}$. Let s be the greatest integer for which there exist a set $I \subset N$ such that $|I| = n - s$ and $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then, the **universal family** is defined as

$$X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ := Y_{s+1}$$

In other words, if we define the set of subvarieties $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}+} := \{D_{I+} \subset X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X \,|\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}\}$ and list its elements in order preserving bijection with the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, that is, $D_{I+} < D_{J+}$ if and only if $\Delta_I < \Delta_J$, then $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+$ is the iterated blowup along dominant transforms of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}+}$ in that order (note that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}+}$ is **not** a building set).

Finally, we define **stage** (k, S) to be the blowup of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$ along the iterated dominant transforms of the subset of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}+}$ obtained by cutting out all elements listed after D_{S+}, where $|S| = n - k$. The Y_k defined above are special cases of the (k, S) stages; for instance, Y_1 is stage $(0, N)$. The dominant transforms of the initial subvarieties $D_I^{(Y_0)}, D_{I+}^{(Y_0)}$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)}$ of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$ in the (k, S) stage are denoted by $D_I^{(S+)}, D_{I+}^{(S+)}$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(S+)}$ respectively.

A few propositions about the geometry of intersections of the subvarieties of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+$ as well as the intermediate steps (k, S) are in order. First, let us recall the notation of the proof of Proposition 1:

We extend the partial order of the set of indices $\{(12\dots n); (12\dots n{-}1), \dots (23\dots n); \dots\}$ of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to a total order:

$$I_0 := (12\dots n) < I_1 := (12\dots n-1) < I_2 := (23\dots n) < \dots < I_{|\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}|}$$

which respects inclusions of diagonals. Based on this, we give the following :

Definition 7. *A **nest** in N_+ is a collection $\mathcal{S}$ of subsets of N_+ such that each pair of subsets is either disjoint or one contains the other and for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\Delta_{S\cap N} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Let $S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. We say that a nest $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies condition $(*)_S$ if:*

$(*)_S$ *$\mathcal{S}$ contains at most one set of the form I_+ with $I > S$ with respect to the above order and if it contains such a set I_+, then it does not contain I.*

Now, let $S \subset N$ such that $|S| = n - k$ and assume that $\{D_J^{(S+)}\}_{J\in\mathcal{S}}$ is a collection of subvarieties of stage (k, S). We have the following:

Proposition 2. *Assume that $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies $(*)_S$. Then, the subvarieties $D_J^{(S+)}$ of stage (k, S), where $J \in \mathcal{S}$, intersect transversally.*

Proposition 3. *Consider $I, S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_I, \Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $I < S$. Then, for any $i \in I$, the subvarieties $D_I^{(S+)}$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(S+)}$ of stage (k, S) intersect transversally along $D_{I+}^{(S+)}$:*

$$D_I^{(S+)} \cap \Delta_{i+}^{(S+)} = D_{I+}^{(S+)}$$

The above propositions are similar to the [FM94, Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.3(b)] and their proofs follow from the definitions and Lemma 2. We also refer the reader to Lemma 8 below for a similar proof.
The crucial step towards for the proof of Theorem 3 is the following:

Proposition 4. *(i) (stability): At stage (k, S) we have:* $\bigcap_{i\in S,|S|=n-k} \Delta_{i+}^{(S+)} = \emptyset$.

(ii) (separation of centers for Y_{k+1}): $D_{S+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \cap D_{T+}^{(Y_{k+1})} = \emptyset$ whenever $|S| = |T| = n - k - 1, S \neq T$ and $\Delta_S, \Delta_T \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

(iii) $D_{S+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \cap D_{T+}^{(Y_{k+1})} = \emptyset$ whenever neither S nor T are contained in each other.

Proof: By the definitions and proposition 1, we have:

$$\bigcap_{i\in S,|S|=n-k} \Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)} = \bigcup_{N\supset T\supset S} D_{T+}^{(Y_0)}$$

Note that we may prove (i) over open covers of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$. To choose an appropriate open cover, we define a **chain** between N and S to be a collection of sets:

$$N := S_0 \supset S_1 \supset \cdots \supset S_k := S$$

such that $|S_i| = n - i$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{N,S}$ be the set of all chains between N and S. For every chain $C \in \mathcal{C}_{N,S}$, define the **complement** of C to be the set

$C' := \{T \,|N \supset T \supset S \,\text{and}\, T \notin C\}$ and denote by $\mathcal{C}'_{N,S}$ the collection of all such C'. Assume $|\mathcal{C}'_{N,S}| = m$ and let $\mathcal{C}'_{N,S} := \{C'_1, C'_2, \dots C'_m\}$ be the set of all complements of the chains in $\mathcal{C}_{N,S}$. Now, let

$$U_C := X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X \setminus \bigcup_{I \in C'} D_{I+}^{(Y_0)}$$

The collection of sets $\{U_C\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{N,S}}$ is an open cover of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}_{N,S}} U_C &= \bigcup_{C' \in \mathcal{C}'_{N,S}} \left(X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X \setminus \bigcup_{I \in C'} D_{I+}^{(Y_0)} \right) \\
&= X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X \setminus \bigcap_{C' \in \mathcal{C}'_{N,S}} \left(\bigcup_{I \in C'} D_{I+}^{(Y_0)} \right) \\
&= X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X \setminus \bigcup_{\{I_i\}_{i=1}^m \in \prod_{i=1}^m C'_i} \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^m {D_{I_i+}}^{(Y_0)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that there exists an intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^m {D_{I_i+}}^{(Y_0)}$ that is nonempty. By Theorem 2(2), we deduce that such an intersection is nonempty precisely when the I_i are nested in the sense that each pair $\{I_i, I_j\}$ either has empty intersection or one set is contained in the other. Since all I_i above contain S, they can't be disjoint, so their intersection can be nonempty only if the indices I_i appearing above are part of a chain between N and S, which we denote by C_{i_0}. However, in this case the complement C'_{i_0} of C_{i_0} appears as a factor in the product $\prod_{i=1}^m C'_i$, so there must be an index $I_{i_0} \in \{I_1, \dots I_m\}$ such that $I_{i_0} \in C'_{i_0}$, which is a contradiction.

Restricting to the above open cover allows us to prove the disjointness of (i) after blowing up at a sequence of iterated strict transforms of ${D_{I+}}^{(Y_0)}$ indexed by a chain between N and S. More specifically, let

$$N := S_0 \supset S_1 \supset \cdots \supset S_k := S$$

be a chain and set $D_{S_i}^{(0)} := {D_{S_i}}^{(Y_0)}$, $D_{S_{i+}}^{(0)} := {D_{S_{i+}}}^{(Y_0)}$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(0)} = \Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)}$. Now consider the ordered subset of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$:

$$\{D_{S_{0+}}^{(0)}, D_{S_{1+}}^{(0)}, \dots, D_{S_{k+}}^{(0)}\}$$

We successively perform blow ups at the iterated dominant transforms of the above set in the above order: let $X_0 = X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$. Set $X_1 = Bl_{D_{S_{0+}}^{(0)}} X_0$ and define $D_{S_0}^{(1)}, D_{S_{0+}}^{(1)}$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(1)}$ to be the dominant transforms of $D_{S_0}^{(0)}, D_{S_{0+}}^{(0)}$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(0)}$ respectively (for $i \in S$).

Inductively we define $X_{j+1} = Bl_{D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} X_j$ and denote by $\pi_{j+1} : X_{j+1} \to X_j$ the blowup map. For each $i, j = 0, \dots k$, let $D^{(j+1)}_{S_i}$ and $D^{(j+1)}_{S_{i+}}$ be the dominant transforms of $D^{(j)}_{S_i}$ and $D^{(j)}_{S_{i+}}$, whereas for $i = 1, \dots k$ and $j = 0, \dots k$ let $\Delta^{(j+1)}_{i+}$ be the strict transform of $\Delta^{(j)}_{i+}$ respectively. We prove the following:

Claim: For all i and j above, we have:

$$\sum_{i \in S_k = S} I_{\Delta^{(j)}_{i+}} = I_{D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+1}^{k} I_{D^{(j)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(j)}_{i'+}} \tag{4}$$

for any $i' \in S$.
Proof of claim: The proof goes by induction on j. When $j = 0$, we have:

$$\sum_{i \in S_k = S} I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i+}} = \sum_{i \in S_k = S} I_{\Delta^{(Y_0)}_{i+}} = \text{(by the definitions and Proposition 1)}$$
$$\left(I_{D^{(0)}_{S_0}} \cap I_{D^{(0)}_{S_1}} \cap \dots \cap I_{D^{(0)}_{S_k}} \right) + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} =$$
$$\prod_{i=0}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}}$$

where the last equation follows from the fact that the $D^{(0)}_{S_i}$ intersect transversally (this is immediate since any collection of divisors D_I in $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ intersects transversally by Theorem 2). The ideal $\prod_{i=0}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}}$ doesn't change if we add the subideal $I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}}$, so

$$\prod_{i=0}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} =$$
$$\left(\prod_{i=0}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} \right) + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} =$$
$$\left(I_{D^{(0)}_{S_0}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} \right) + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} =$$
$$\left(I_{D^{(0)}_{S_0}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} \right) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}} = \text{(by the definitions)}$$
$$I_{D^{(0)}_{S_{0+}}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k} I_{D^{(0)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(0)}_{i'+}}$$

which proves the claim for $j = 0$.
Now, assume the claim is true for j. We have

$$\sum_{i\in S_k=S} I_{\Delta^{(j+1)}_{i+}} = \text{(by lemma 2.1(b))}$$

$$\sum_{i\in S_k=S} I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}\Delta^{(j)}_{i+}} \cdot I^{-1}_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} = \text{(by (4))}$$

$$\left(I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+1}^{k} I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_i}} + I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}\Delta^{(j)}_{i'+}} \right) \cdot I^{-1}_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} \tag{5}$$

Now, by lemma 2.1(b), we have

$$I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}\Delta^{(j)}_{i'+}} = I_{\Delta^{(j+1)}_{i'+}} \cdot I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} \tag{6}$$

Also, by proposition 2, $D^{(j)}_{S_i}$, $i \geq j+1$ is transversal to the center $D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}$, hence, by lemma 2.1(a)

$$I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_i}} = I_{D^{(j+1)}_{S_i}} \tag{7}$$

Therefore, in view of (6) and (7), (5) reads

$$\left(I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+1}^{k} I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_i}} + I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}\Delta^{(j)}_{i'+}} \right) \cdot I^{-1}_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} =$$

$$\left(I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+1}^{k} I_{D^{(j+1)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(j+1)}_{i'+}} \cdot I_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} \right) \cdot I^{-1}_{\pi^{-1}_{j+1}D^{(j)}_{S_{j+}}} =$$

$$\prod_{i=j+1}^{k} I_{D^{(j+1)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(j+1)}_{i'+}} =$$

$$I_{D^{(j+1)}_{S_{j+1}}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+2}^{k} I_{D^{(j+1)}_{S_i}} + I_{\Delta^{(j+1)}_{i'+}} \tag{8}$$

Adding the subideal $I_{\Delta_{i'+}^{(j+1)}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+2}^{k} I_{D_{S_i}^{(j+1)}}$ to (8) doesn't change anything so the ideal of (8) is equal to

$$\left(I_{D_{S_{j+1}}^{(j+1)}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+2}^{k} I_{D_{S_i}^{(j+1)}} + I_{\Delta_{i'+}^{(j+1)}}\right) + I_{\Delta_{i'+}^{(j+1)}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+2}^{k} I_{D_{S_i}^{(j+1)}} =$$

$$\left(I_{D_{S_{j+1}}^{(j+1)}} + I_{\Delta_{i'+}^{(j+1)}}\right) \cdot \prod_{i=j+2}^{k} I_{D_{S_i}^{(j+1)}} + I_{\Delta_{i'+}^{(j+1)}} = \text{(by Proposition 3)}$$

$$I_{D_{S_{j+1+}}^{(j+1)}} \cdot \prod_{i=j+2}^{k} I_{D_{S_i}^{(j+1)}} + I_{\Delta_{i'+}^{(j+1)}}$$

which proves the claim for $j+1$, hence the proof of the claim is now complete.

Setting $j = k$ in the claim shows (since $\prod_{i=j+1}^{k} I_{D_{S_i}^{(j)}}$ is vacuous) that

$$\sum_{i \in S_k = S} I_{\Delta_{i+}^{(k)}} = I_{D_{S_{k+}}^{(k)}} + I_{\Delta_{i'+}^{(k)}} = I_{D_{S_{k+}}^{(k)}}$$

where in the last equality we use the fact that $\Delta_{i'+}^{(k)} \supset D_{S_{k+}}^{(k)}$, since $i' \in S_k = S$. By lemma 2(2), we see that the strict transforms of the $\Delta_{i+}^{(k)}$ do not intersect simultaneously in X_{k+1}, that is, the iterated strict transforms of $\Delta_{i+}^{(0)} = \Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)}$, $i \in S$ do not intersect simultaneously in the open cover $\{U_C\}_{C \in \mathcal{C}'_{N,S}}$ of stage (k, S), hence

$$\bigcap_{i \in S, |S| = n-k} \Delta_{i+}^{(S+)} = \emptyset$$

in stage (k, S). This shows part (i) of the Proposition.

Part (ii) now follows from (i). Let $S, T \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S, \Delta_T \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $|S| = |T| = n - k - 1, S \neq T$. By definition, we have $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)} \supset D_{S+}^{(Y_0)}$ for all $i \in S$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)} \supset D_{T+}^{(Y_0)}$ for all $i \in T$. Therefore we deduce the inclusions of their iterated strict transforms $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \supset D_{S+}^{(Y_{k+1})}$ for all $i \in S$ and $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \supset D_{T+}^{(Y_{k+1})}$ for all $i \in T$ respectively. This, in turn, implies that

$$D_{S+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \cap D_{T+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \subset \bigcap_{i \in S \cup T} \Delta_{i+}^{(Y_{k+1})}, \tag{9}$$

However, the assumptions on S and T imply that $|S \cup T| \geq n - k$. Let $U \subset S \cup T$ be such that $|U| = n - k$ and $\Delta_U \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. By part (i), we have $\bigcap_{i \in U} \Delta_{i+}^{(U+)} = \emptyset$. Since Y_{k+1} is obtained from stage (k, U) by a finite sequence of blowups we have that the strict transforms of the $\Delta_{i+}^{(U+)}$ in Y_{k+1} also have empty intersection, that is:

$$\bigcap_{i\in U} \Delta_{i+}^{(Y_{k+1})} = \emptyset \tag{10}$$

Finally, (9) and (10) together imply that

$$D_{S+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \cap D_{T+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \subset \bigcap_{i\in S\cup T} \Delta_{i+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \subset \bigcap_{i\in U} \Delta_{i+}^{(Y_{k+1})} = \emptyset$$

that is $D_{S+}^{(Y_{k+1})} \cap D_{T+}^{(Y_{k+1})} = \emptyset$, hence the proof of part (ii).

The proof of part (iii) is identical to the proof of (ii) and is therefore omitted. □

Proof of Theorem 3: By the above Proposition, it follows that the fibers of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ are the $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations described in section 2.2.1 with n sections induced by the strict transforms of the $\Delta_{i+}^{(Y_0)} \subset X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$ under the sequence of blowups $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X$ and vice versa. Since the fibers are then equidimensional and the varieties $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+$ and $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ are nonsingular, we conclude that $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is flat. □

2.4. **Functorial Description.** Let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ as above and $S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Now let $F : (Sch/k) \to (Set)$ be the functor that to every scheme H assigns the set of pairs of morphisms (of schemes and sheaves)

$$\{f : H \to X^n \, , f^* I_{\Delta_S} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_S\}$$

for all $S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, with $\mathcal{L}_S$ invertible and the compatibility condition that if $T \subset S \subset N$ there exists a (necessarily unique) morphism $\mathcal{L}_T \to \mathcal{L}_S$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^* I_{\Delta_T} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{L}_T \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ f^* I_{\Delta_S} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{L}_S \end{array}$$

commutes.

Theorem 4. *(cf.* [FM94, Theorem 4]*) The functor F is representable by the variety $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$.*

Proof: First, let us assume that there exists a morphism $g : H \to X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$. Composing with the blowup morphism $\pi : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X^n$, we get a morphism $f = \pi \circ g : H \to X^n$.



Now, set $\mathcal{L}_S := g^* I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_S}$. By theorem 1(3), $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is isomorphic to the iterated blowup along the total inverse images of the ideal sheaves of the diagonals that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Therefore, $I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_S}$ is invertible, which implies that $\mathcal{L}_S$ is invertible as well. Moreover, we have a canonical surjection

$$\pi^* I_{\Delta_S} \twoheadrightarrow I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_S}$$

which further induces a surjection

$$f^* I_{\Delta_S} \cong g^*\pi^* I_{\Delta_S} \twoheadrightarrow g^* I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_S} = \mathcal{L}_S.$$

If $T \subset S$ then $\Delta_T \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, so $I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_T}$ is also invertible. We obtain the following commutative diagram of sheaves on H:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi^* I_{\Delta_T} & \twoheadrightarrow & I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_T} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \pi^* I_{\Delta_S} & \twoheadrightarrow & I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_T} \end{array}$$

We then apply g^* to the above diagram to get the desired commutative diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f^* I_{\Delta_T} \cong g^*\pi^* I_{\Delta_T} & \twoheadrightarrow & g^* I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_T} = \mathcal{L}_T \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ f^* I_{\Delta_S} \cong g^*\pi^* I_{\Delta_S} & \twoheadrightarrow & g^* I_{\pi^{-1}\Delta_S} = \mathcal{L}_S \end{array}$$

Conversely, let us assume that there exists a morphism $f : H \to X^n$ and compatible invertible quotients $f^* I_{\Delta_S} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_S$ for all $S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. We will show that we can lift f to $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ by induction. First, observe that $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ may be obtained as a sequence of blowups along iterated dominant transforms of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, this time written in a different order as follows:

Consider the set

$$\mathcal{G}^{FM} : \{\Delta_{12}; \Delta_{123}; \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{23}; \Delta_{1234}; \Delta_{124}, \Delta_{134}, \Delta_{234}; \Delta_{14}, \Delta_{24}, \Delta_{34}; \dots\}$$

This is the set of blowup centers used in the Fulton and Macpherson compactification [FM94] (also, see example 1). The strict transforms of the diagonals separated by a comma are disjoint, so for these particular centers the order that the blowups are taken

does not matter. Now, consider the set obtained from $\mathcal{G}^{FM}$ by deleting the diagonals indexed by coordinates whose sum of weights is less than or equal to 1:

$$\mathcal{G}^{FM}_{\mathcal{A}} := \mathcal{G} \setminus \{\Delta_S | S \subset N \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} a_i \leq 1\}$$

Now write its elements preserving the above order of $\mathcal{G}^{FM}$. We make the following claim:

Claim: The set $\mathcal{G}^{FM}_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the assumption of Theorem 1(2).
Proof of Claim: Consider the set of the first i elements $\mathcal{G}^{FM}_{\mathcal{A},i}$ and pick an arbitrary subset of the latter consisting of k elements $\{\Delta_{I_1}, \Delta_{I_2}, \ldots, \Delta_{I_k}\}$, where $I_1 < I_2 \cdots < I_k$ in the above order. Now, take the intersection $S_k := \Delta_{I_1} \cap \Delta_{I_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta_{I_k}$. We need to show that the minimal elements of $\mathcal{G}^{FM}_{\mathcal{A},i}$ containing S_k intersect transversally along S_k. Let l be the greatest integer contained in I_k. We partition the above set of indices in two subsets $\{\Delta_{I_1}, \Delta_{I_2}, \ldots, \Delta_{I_{k'}}\}$ and $\{\Delta_{I_{k'+1}}, \Delta_{I_{k'+2}}, \ldots, \Delta_{I_k}\}$ such that the greatest integer contained in each of the $I_{k'+1}, I_{k'+2}, \ldots I_k$ is l, whereas the greatest integer contained in $I_{k'}$ is $l-1$. The first set could be empty; in this case the claim follows trivially, so we assume that it is non empty. Then we have $\Delta_{I_{k'+1}} \cap \Delta_{I_{k'+2}} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta_{I_k} = \Delta_{I \cup \{l\}}$, where $I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots l-1\}$. Now consider the intersection $\Delta_{I_1} \cap \Delta_{I_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta_{I_{k'}} \cap \Delta_I$. As in the proof of Lemma 1, the latter can be written uniquely as $\Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \cdots \cap \Delta_{J_{k''}}$, where $k'' \leq k'$ and for $j = 1, \ldots k''$, the sets J_j are unions of some of the I_m and I ($m = 1, \ldots k'$) and also pairwise disjoint. Then, there exists a unique set, say J_s, among the J_j above that contains I. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_k &:= (\Delta_{I_1} \cap \Delta_{I_2} \cap \ldots \Delta_{I_{k'}}) \cap (\Delta_{I_{k'+1}} \cdots \cap \Delta_{I_k}) \\ &= (\Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \cdots \cap \Delta_{J_{k''}}) \cap \Delta_{I \cup \{l\}} \\ &= (\Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \ldots \Delta_{J_{s-1}} \cap \Delta_{J_{s+1}} \cap \ldots \Delta_{J_{k''}}) \cap (\Delta_{J_s} \cap \Delta_{I \cup \{l\}}) \\ &= \Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \ldots \Delta_{J_{s-1}} \cap \Delta_{J_{s+1}} \cap \ldots \Delta_{J_{k''}} \cap \Delta_{J_s \cup \{l\}} \end{aligned}$$

Since the J_j are pairwise disjoint subsets of $\{1, 2, \ldots, l-1\}$ we see that the indices appearing in the last equation above are also pairwise disjoint. Moreover, each of the J_j with $j \neq s$ contains some I_m where $m \leq k'$, so

$$\sum_{i \in J_j} a_i \geq \sum_{i \in I_m} a_i > 1$$

In addition, since the J_j above with $j \neq s$ are unions of the $I_m \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, l-1\}$ the maximum integer contained in each of them is less than or equal to $l-1$. This implies that $\Delta_{J_j} < \Delta_{I_{k'+1}}$ for all $j \neq s$, which in turn implies $\Delta_{J_j} \in \mathcal{G}^{FM}_{\mathcal{A},i}$ for all $j \neq s$.

Similarly we see that $\Delta_{J_s \cup \{l\}} \in \mathcal{G}^{FM}_{\mathcal{A},i}$. Therefore, the minimal elements in $\mathcal{G}^{FM}_{\mathcal{A},i}$ that contain S_k are precisely the sets $\Delta_{J_1}, \Delta_{J_2}, \Delta_{J_{s-1}}, \Delta_{J_{s+1}}, \ldots \Delta_{J_{k''}}, \Delta_{J_s \cup \{l\}}$, which are seen

to intersect transversally -as varieties- since the indices they are indexed by are disjoint.

In view of the claim, we deduce, by Theorem 1(2), that $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is isomorphic to the blowup along the iterated dominant transforms of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{FM}$ in the order described above. The proof is then essentially identical to the proof in [FM94, theorem 4]. □

2.5. **Reduction and Forgetful morphisms.** The results of this section are the analogues of [Has03, Section 4]. See also [AG08], [BM09].

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\mathcal{B} := \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ be two sets of rational numbers such that $0 < b_i \leq a_i \leq 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots n$. There exists a natural blowup (reduction) morphism*

$$\rho_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{A}} : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{B}}[n]$$

At the level of k points, the above morphism reassigns the weights of the sections of an $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration and then successively collapses all components that are unstable with respect to $\mathcal{B}$.

Proof: As in section 2.2, let

$$\mathcal{G} := \{\Delta_{12\dots n}; \Delta_{12\dots(n-1)}, \dots, \Delta_{23\dots n}; \dots; \Delta_{12}, \dots, \Delta_{(n-1)n}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{G} \setminus \{\Delta_S | S \subset N \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} b_i \leq 1\}$$

and write the elements of the latter in ascending dimension order. By Lemma 1, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a building set. By the hypothesis, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. For ease of notation, denote the ideal sheaves of the $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ by $I_1, I_2, \dots I_k$ in order preserving bijection with the Δ_S in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Similarly, let $\{I_{i_1}, I_{i_2}, \dots I_{i_l}\} \subset \{I_1, I_2, \dots I_k\}$ be the set of ideal sheaves of the $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$, listed again in order preserving bijection with the Δ_S in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] &\cong Bl_{I_k} \dots Bl_{I_2} Bl_{I_1} X^n \text{ (theorem 1(3))} \\ &\cong Bl_{I_k} \dots \left(Bl_{I_{i_l}} \dots Bl_{I_{i_2}} Bl_{I_{i_1}} X^n \right) \text{ ([Li09, Lemma 3.2])} \\ &\cong Bl_{I_k} \dots X_{\mathcal{B}}[n] \end{aligned}$$

therefore there is a natural blowup map along centers corresponding to $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$

$$\rho_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{A}} : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{B}}[n]$$

□

With notation as in Theorem 5, we have:

Proposition 5. *Let $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$, $\mathcal{B} := \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ and $\mathcal{C} := \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$ be sets of rational numbers such that $0 < c_i \leq b_i \leq a_i \leq 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots n$. Then:*

$$\rho_{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{A}} = \rho_{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{B}} \circ \rho_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{A}}$$

Proof: With notation as in the proof of Theorem 5 above, we have $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. We also see that $\rho_{\mathcal{B},\mathcal{A}} : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{B}}[n]$ is the blowup along centers corresponding to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$, whereas $\rho_{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{B}} : X_{\mathcal{B}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{C}}[n]$ is the blowup along centers corresponding to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}}$, hence their composition is the blowup along centers corresponding to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{C}}$. This is precisley the morphism $\rho_{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{A}} : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{C}}[n]$, as we saw in the proof of Theorem 5. □

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathcal{A}' := \{a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \dots a_{i_r}\}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $r \leq n$. There exists a natural forgetful morphism*

$$\phi_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}'} : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{A}'}[r]$$

At the level of k points, the above morphism successively collapses all components of an $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration that are unstable with respect to $\mathcal{A}'$.

Proof: We begin with the following general *remark*: let $\{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_m\}$ be a collection of subsets of the set $\{i_1, i_2, \dots i_r\}$. Then we have

$$\left(Bl_{\Delta_{I_m}} \dots Bl_{\Delta_{I_1}} X^r\right) \times_{X^r} X^n \cong Bl_{\Delta_{I_m}} \dots Bl_{\Delta_{I_1}} X^n \tag{11}$$

We explain the notation: on the left hand side of the above isomorphism each diagonal Δ_{I_j} is considered a subvariety inside X^r, whereas on the right hand side we consider the corresponding diagonal in X^n, that is we consider I_j as a subset of N. On both sides, X^r and X^n respectively are successively blown up along the **total inverse images** of the Δ_{I_k}. Now, the isomorphism (11) is a direct consequence of the fact that the formation of the blowup commutes with smooth base change.

Next, consider $\{i_1, i_2, \dots i_r\}$ as a subset of N. Let

$$\mathcal{G} := \{\Delta_{12\dots n}; \Delta_{12\dots(n-1)}, \dots, \Delta_{23\dots n}; \dots; \Delta_{12}, \dots, \Delta_{(n-1)n}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}'} := \mathcal{G} \setminus \{\Delta_S | S \subset N \text{ and } \sum_{i_k \in S} a_{i_k} \leq 1\}$$

and write the elements of the latter in ascending dimension order. As in the proof of Theorem 5, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}'}$ is a building set (of its induced arrangement of subvarieties in X^n) such that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}'} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and if $\{J_1, J_2, \dots J_l\}$ are the ideal sheaves of the $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}'}$, then there is a natural blowup map along centers corresponding to $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}'}$

$$X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to Bl_{J_l} \dots Bl_{J_1} X^n \tag{12}$$

Now, we go back to the remark of the first paragraph. With notation as in the first paragraph, set $m = l$ and take Δ_{I_k} (where Δ_{I_k} is considered as a subvariety of X^n) to be the diagonal whose ideal sheaf is J_k, $k = 1, \dots l$. We then have

$$Bl_{J_l} \dots Bl_{J_1} X^n \cong (Bl_{J_l} \dots Bl_{J_1} X^r) \times_{X^r} X^n \tag{13}$$

where the J_k in the first isomorphism of (13) are the ideal sheaves of Δ_{I_k} considered as subvarieties of X^r.

By Theorem 1(3), we have $Bl_{J_l} \dots Bl_{J_1} X^r \cong X_{\mathcal{A}'}[r]$, hence

$$(Bl_{J_l} \dots Bl_{J_1} X^r) \times_{X^r} X^n \cong X_{\mathcal{A}'}[r] \times_{X^r} X^n \tag{14}$$

Therefore composing the morphisms in (12), (13) and (14) we get a morphism $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{A}'}[r] \times_{X^r} X^n$. Composing further with the projection $X_{\mathcal{A}'}[r] \times_{X^r} X^n \to X_{\mathcal{A}'}[r]$ we obtain the required morphism

$$\phi_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}'} : X_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_{\mathcal{A}'}[r]$$

□

3. Relative stable degenerations

3.1. **The relative weighted compactification.** Let $f : X \to Y$ be a smooth morphism between two smooth varieties X and Y. Moreover, let $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be a set of rational numbers such that

- $0 < a_i \leq 1, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

Let

$$\mathcal{G}^{rel} := \{\Delta_{12\dots n}; \Delta_{12\dots(n-1)}, \dots, \Delta_{23\dots n}; \dots; \Delta_{12}, \dots, \Delta_{(n-1)n}\}$$

be the set of diagonals of the n-fold fibered product $X^n_Y := \underbrace{X \times_Y \times \cdots \times_Y X}_{n factors}$ listed in ascending dimension order.

Now let

$$\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}} := \{\Delta_S \subset X^n_Y | S \subset N \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} a_i > 1\}$$

and list its elements in ascending dimension order.

Definition 8. *The relative weighted configuration space with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ is the complement of the union of the diagonals that belong to $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in X^n_Y*

$$F^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}(X/Y, n) := X^n_Y \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \ .$$

The relative weighted configuration space may be viewed as the parameter space of n labeled points on the fibers of f carrying weights a_i subject to the following condition:

- for any set of labels $S \subset N$of coincident points we have $\sum_{i\in S} a_i \leq 1$.

We construct a weighted compactification of the above configuration space as the space of $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations (see Section 2) on the fibers of f.

Definition 9. *The relative weighted compactification of the relative configuration space $F^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}(X/Y,n)$ is the closure of the image of the diagonal embedding*

$$X^n_Y \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I\in\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n_Y \times \prod_{\Delta_I\in\ \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} Bl_{\Delta_I} X^n_Y$$

We denote the relative weighted compactification by $X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]$.

Remark:In case $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \leq 1$, then $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is empty and $X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]$ is trivially equal to X^n_Y.

Remark: Since the relative configuration space of n *distinct* labeled points $X^n_Y \setminus \bigcup_{|I|\geq 2} \Delta_I$ is an open subset of $X^n_Y \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I\in\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I$, the closure of

$$X^n_Y \setminus \bigcup_{|I|\geq 2} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n_Y \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I\in\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n_Y \times \prod_{\Delta_I\in\ \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} Bl_{\Delta_I} X^n_Y$$

is the same as the closure of

$$X^n_Y \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I\in\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} \Delta_I \hookrightarrow X^n_Y \times \prod_{\Delta_I\in\ \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}} Bl_{\Delta_I} X^n_Y.$$

Therefore, the variety $X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]$ may be viewed as a compactification of the relative configuration space $F^{rel}(X/Y,n)$ of n *distinct* labeled points on the fibers of $X \to Y$ and consequently as a 'weighted' generalization of the Fulton Macpherson compactification to the relative context.

Proposition 6. *The relative weighted compactification $X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]$ is isomorphic to the iterated blowup of the n-fold fibered product X^n_Y along the dominant transforms of the diagonals in $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in ascending dimension order.*

Proof: The statement is Zariski local, so we may assume Y is irreducible after base changing to the (open) irreducible components of Y(note that Y is smooth). Moreover, it suffices to prove the statement after restricting to the irreducible components of X^n_Y; those are open and disjoint, since X^n_Y is a smooth variety. So, let U be an (open) irreducible component of X^n_Y. For any $I \subset N$ such that $|I| \geq 2$, define $\Delta^U_I := \Delta_I \cap U$ and set

$$\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A},U} := \{\Delta_I \cap U | \Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ and } \Delta^U_I \neq \emptyset\}$$

and, as usual, write the elements of the above set in ascending dimension order.

Claim: $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A},U}$ is a building set of subvarieties of U.
Proof of Claim: First, observe that the schemes $\Delta^U_I \in \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A},U}$ are irreducible subvarieties of U. Indeed, each diagonal Δ_I may be considered as an embedding $X^{I'}_Y \hookrightarrow X^N_Y$, where $I' = (N \setminus I) \cup \{i\}$ for any element $i \in I$, induced by the identity morphism on $X^{N\setminus I}_Y$ and the diagonal embedding $X^{\{i\}} \hookrightarrow X^I_Y$ over Y. This embedding is then a section $X^{I'}_Y \hookrightarrow X^N_Y \xrightarrow{p_{I'}} X^{I'}_Y$ of the projection $p_{I'}$ onto the coordinates of X^N_Y labeled by I' . Both $X^{I'}_Y$ and X^N_Y are disjoint unions of their irreducible(connected) components. If $\Delta_I \cap U \neq \emptyset$, then any component of $\Delta_I = X^{I'}_Y$ either is contained in U or is disjoint from it. Moreover we cannot have two (disjoint) components of $X^{I'}_Y$ contained in U; this would imply that the image of the irreducible component U under p_I meets those two disjoint components, which is absurd. Therefore, if $\Delta_I \cap U \neq \emptyset$, then Δ^U_I is equal to the unique component of $\Delta_I = X^{I'}_Y$ contained in U, hence it is irreducible.

To conclude the proof of the claim consider a nonempty intersection of elements of $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A},U}$, say $S_k = \Delta^U_{I_1} \cap \Delta^U_{I_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{I_k}$, where $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}$. We need to show that the minimal elements of $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A},U}$ that contain the above intersection intersect transversally and that their intersection is S_k. By the proof of Lemma 1, we can write the intersection $\Delta_{I_1} \cap \Delta_{I_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta_{I_k}$ as an intersection of diagonals $\Delta_{J_1} \cap \Delta_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta_{J'_k}$ in X^n_Y, where $k' \leq k$ and the J_j are unions of some of the I_i and pairwise disjoint. Since S_k is nonempty, restricting to U gives the relation $S_k = \Delta^U_{I_1} \cap \Delta^U_{I_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{I_k} = \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}}$ in U, where the $\Delta^U_{J_j}$ are nonemtpy for $j = 1, \ldots, k'$. The sum of the weights of the coordinates of Δ_{J_j} is greater than 1, because each J_j contains some I_i. Also, the $\Delta^U_{J_j}$ intersect transversally along S_k, since they are indexed by disjoint sets. What remains to be verified in this case is that the $\Delta^U_{J_j}$ are the minimal elements of $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A},U}$ that contain S_k. To see this, let $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be such that

$$\Delta^U_S \supseteq \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}} \tag{15}$$

Observe that S must be contained in the union $\mathcal{I} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} J_j$. For assume the contrary;

we then distinguish two cases:

(a) $S \cap \mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$. Then S can be written as a union of two nonempty disjoint subsets $S = S' \cup S''$, where $S' \subset \mathcal{I}$ and $S'' \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$. Assume, without loss of generality, that J_1 intersects S' and set $S_0 := (S' \cap J_1) \cup S''$. Then, $\Delta^U_{S_0} \supseteq \Delta^U_S$, so by (15) we get

$$\Delta^U_{S_0} \cap \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}} = \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}}$$

which, since $\Delta^U_{S_0} \cap \Delta^U_{J_1} = \Delta^U_{J_1 \cup S''}$, implies that

$$\Delta^U_{J_1 \cup S''} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}} = \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}}$$

All indices appearing on both sides of the above equation are pairwise disjoint so the intersections on both sides are transversal. Therefore the codimension of both sides in U is equal to the sum of the codimensions of each of the subvarieties appearing in the intersections on each side. However, we saw above that the (nonempty) intersection of U with any diagonal is the unique component of the diagonal contained in U. Since the diagonals are pure dimensional, we have $dim \Delta^U_{J_1 \cup S''} > dim \Delta^U_{J_1}$, so we get a contradiction.

(b) $S \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$. In this case, again by equation (15), we obtain the equality:

$$\Delta^U_S \cap \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}} = \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}}$$

Since all indices appearing on each side are disjoint, each of the intersections appearing in the above equation is transversal. This implies, in particular, that $cod(\Delta^U_S, U) = 0$, which is a contradiciton.

Next, we show that there must be a unique set among the $J_j\,, j = 1, \ldots k'$ containing S. Indeed, assume that S intersects at least two sets of indices among the J_j, and suppose without loss of generality that those are the sets J_1 and J_2. Let $S^* = S \cap (J_1 \cup J_2)$. Then $\Delta^U_{S^*} \supseteq \Delta^U_S$, so, by equation (15), we conclude that

$$\Delta^U_{S^*} \cap \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}} = \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}}$$

Now, by the definition of S^*, we have $\Delta^U_{S^*} \cap \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} = \Delta^U_{J_1 \cup J_2}$, hence

$$\Delta^U_{J_1 \cup J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}} = \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}}$$

Since the above indices appearing on both sides of the above equations are disjoint, both intersections on each side are transversal. This implies, in particular, that

$$cod(\Delta^U_{J_1 \cup J_2}, U) = cod(\Delta^U_{J_1}, U) + cod(\Delta^U_{J_2}, U)$$

which, in turn, implies that $|J_1 \cup J_2| - 1 = (|J_1| - 1) + (|J_2| - 1)$, since, as we saw above, the diagonals are pure dimensional and the restrictions to U are the unique components contained in U. This is a contradiction, since J_1 is disjoint from J_2.

Therefore, if $S \subseteq J_j$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots k'\}$, we have $\Delta^U_S \supseteq \Delta^U_{J_j}$, so we finally see that the minimal elements of $\mathcal{G}^{rel}_{\mathcal{A},U}$ that contain $S_k = \Delta^U_{I_1} \cap \Delta^U_{I_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{I_k} = \Delta^U_{J_1} \cap \Delta^U_{J_2} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta^U_{J_{k'}}$ are precisely the elements $\Delta^U_{J_j}$, where $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k'$. This completes the proof of the claim.

Now, in view of the claim and since we wrote the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$ in ascending dimension order, we conclude, by [Li09, Proposition 2.13], that the sequence of blowups along the strict transforms of the subvarieties $\Delta_I^U \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},U}^{rel}$ coincides with the closure of the diagonal embedding

$$U \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I^U \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},U}^{rel}} \Delta_I^U \hookrightarrow U \times \prod_{\Delta_I^U \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},U}^{rel}} Bl_{\Delta_I^U} U$$

hence the proposition.

□

Remark: In the above proof we assumed that the general fiber was reducible. In particular, when Y is an algebraically closed field, the above proposition shows that we can extend the definitions of section 2 to reducible schemes.

Theorem 7. *(1) The variety $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is nonsingular. The boundary $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \setminus (X_Y^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}} \Delta_I)$ is the union of $|\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}|$ divisors D_Y^I, where $I \subset N, |I| \geq 2$ and $\sum_{i \in I} a_i > 1$.*

(2) Any set of boundary divisors intersects transversally. An intersection of divisors $D_Y^{I_1} \cap D_Y^{I_2} \cap \ldots D_Y^{I_k}$ is nonempty precisely when the sets are nested in the sense that any pair $\{I_i, I_j\}$ either has empty intersection or one set is contained in the other.

Proof: It suffices to prove the statement on the (open) irreducible components of X_Y^n. Then we have, from the proof of proposition 6, that the restrictions of the diagonals of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$ form a building set, so the proof is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.

Remark: The divisors D_Y^I above are precisely the dominant transforms of the $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$, under the identification of $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ as a sequence of blowups $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_Y^n$ verified in proposition 6.

Now let us examine the fibers of the family $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to Y$. We have the following:

Proposition 7. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a smooth morphism between smooth varieties. For a given $y \in Y$, let X_y be the fiber of f over y. Then there exists an isomorphism*

$$(X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n])_y \cong (X_y)_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$$

Proof: In Proposition 6 we showed that the morphism $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ may be obtained from X_Y^N as a sequence of blowups at centers that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$. The statement is Zariski local over the base, so after base changing to an irreducible component of Y, which is open since Y is nonsingular, we may assume that the base is irreducible. We prove the proposition under the additional assumption that the general fiber is irreducible, which is the case of interest in the sequel, although it will be obvious from the proof that

the general case is also true. Under this assumption, since the morphism $X_Y^N \to Y$ is smooth, so open, and because Y is irreducible, we deduce that X_Y^N is irreducible. The proof is essentially identical to the proof of Proposition 1 in [Pan95]. Let m be the number of blowups needed and $\pi_m : X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_Y^N$ be the resulting morphism. Also, denote by $X_Y^{N,i}$ be the variety resulting form the i-th blowup and let $\pi_i : X_Y^{N,i} \to X_Y^N$ the corresponding blowup morphism, where $0 \leq i \leq m$. Finally let Δ_Y^i be the center of the $(i+1)$-th blowup $X_Y^{N,i+1} \to X_Y^{N,i}$ and let Δ_y^i be the center of the $(i+1)$-th blowup $X_y^{N,i+1} \to X_y^{N,i}$. Then we can show, by induction on the integer i, that there exists a natural isomorphism

$$(X_Y^{N,i})_y \cong X_y^{N,i} \tag{16}$$

for all $y \in Y$. Here, $X_y^{N,i}$ is the variety obtained after blowing up the i-th element in the collection of subsets $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of X_y^N (see section 2.2).

We need the following claim found in the proof of proposition 1 in [Pan95]:

Claim: Let S be an irreducible smooth variety. Suppose that $R \to S$ is a smooth morphism and $T \hookrightarrow R$ is a closed immersion such that T is smooth over S. Then, for any $s \in S$ we have

$$(Bl_T R)_s \cong Bl_{T_s} R_s$$

When $i = 0$, equation (16) reads $(X_Y^N)_y \cong X_y^N$, which is clear. Now, assume equation (16) holds for some i. From this we deduce the equality

$$(\Delta_Y^i)_y \cong \Delta_y^i \tag{17}$$

where the above isomorphism is the restriction of the isomorphism in (16) to $(\Delta_Y^i)_y$. $X_y^{N,i}$ is obtained from the smooth variety X_y by sequence of blowups along smooth centers, so it is smooth. Consequently, we deduce from (16) that $(X_Y^{N,i})_y$ is also smooth for all $y \in Y$. This implies that the morphism

$$X_Y^{N,i} \to Y \tag{18}$$

is smooth. Moreover, we have seen that Δ_y^i is smooth by construction (section 2.2), so by (17), $(\Delta_Y^i)_y$ is also smooth, thus we conclude that the morphism

$$\Delta_Y^i \to Y \tag{19}$$

is smooth. So, finally, we may apply the claim to $\Delta_Y^i \hookrightarrow X_Y^{N,i}$ and make use of the isomorphism (17) to conclude that the fiber of the blowup of $X_Y^{N,i}$ at Δ_Y^i is isomorphic to the blowup of X_y^N at Δ_y^i, that is

$$(X_Y^{N,i+1})_y \cong X_y^{N,i+1}$$

which proves the inductive statement (16) for $i+1$. By setting $i = m$ in (16) we complete the proof of proposition. □

3.1.1. *The relative weighted universal family.* The construction of the universal family of Theorem 3 can be generalized to the relative case for our purposes. We construct the family as a sequence of blowups along subvarieties of $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times_Y X$.

More specifically, consider the boundary divisors $D_{Y,I}$ of $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ (Theorem 7). Those are the iterated dominant transforms of the diagonals Δ_I of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$; let $D_{Y,I} \to \Delta_I$ be the natural morphism; we may identify Δ_I with X in X^I. Now consider the graph of the above morphism $D_{Y,I} \hookrightarrow X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times_Y X$ and define:

$$D_{Y,I+} \subset X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times_Y X$$

to be its image. Now define the set:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel,+} := \{D_{Y,I+} \subset X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times_Y X \,|\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}\}$$

and write its elements in order preserving bijection with the elements of $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$, i.e. $D_{Y,I+} < D_{Y,J+}$ if and only if $\Delta_I < \Delta_J$. Note: we have seen that as long as the Δ_I are written in ascending dimension order, the resulting space $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ remains the same. We will see below that as long as this condition is satisfied, all $D_{Y,I+} \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel,+}$ with $|I| = n-k$ become disjoint at the k-th step (see below).

We now define some intermediate steps Z_k inductively as in section 2.3: To begin with, set

- $Z_0 := X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times_Y X$.
- $D_{Y,I+}^{(0)} := D_{Y,I+}$, for all $I \subset N$ such that $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$
- For each $i \in N$ we define $\Delta_{Y,i+}^{(0)}$ to be the embedding of $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ in $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times_Y X$ given by the graph of the morphism $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_Y^n \xrightarrow{p_i} X$, where p_i is the projection to the i-th factor.

Assume Z_k is defined. We will call Z_k the **k-th step**. Then we define:

- Z_{k+1} to be the blowup of Z_k along the disjoint union of the subvarieties $D_{Y,I+}^{(k)}$, where $|I| = n-k$ and $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$; those subvarieties will be shown to be disjoint in the sequel.
- for any $I \subset N$ s.t $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, the variety $D_{Y,I+}^{(k+1)}$ is the dominant transform of $D_{Y,I+}^{(k)}$.
- for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the variety $\Delta_{Y,i+}^{(k+1)}$ is the strict transform of $\Delta_{Y,i+}^{(k)}$.

Let s be the greatest integer for which there exist a set $I \subset N$ such that $|I| = n-s$ and $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{rel}$. Then, the **universal family** is defined as

$$X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ := Z_{s+1}$$

and let

$$\sigma_i := \Delta^{(s+1)}_{Y,i+}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

As in Proposition 7, we can show that, if $y \in Y$ and X_y is the fiber of $X \to Y$, then:

$$(X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]^+)_y \cong (X_y)_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \tag{20}$$

Indeed, this is shown by induction on the number of steps k as in Proposition 7. Let $|I| = n - k - 1$. Also, suppose V_k is the k-th step and $D^{(k)}_{I+}$ are the centers of the $k+1$-th step in the construction of $(X_y)_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+$, as defined in section 2.3. Finally let $\Delta^{(k)}_{i+}$, $i = 1, \dots n$, be the sections of $V_k \to (X_y)_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$. We can show that:

$$(Z_k)_y \cong V_k$$

from which we deduce, via restriction, that

$$(D^{(k+1)}_{Y,I+})_y \cong D^{(k+1)}_{I+} \tag{21}$$

and

$$(\Delta^{(k+1)}_{Y,i+})_y \cong \Delta^{(k+1)}_{i+} \tag{22}$$

When $k = 0$, we have

$$(Z_0)_y = (X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n] \times_Y X)_y = (X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]_y) \times X_y \cong (X_y)_{\mathcal{A}}[n] \times X_y = V_0$$

by Proposition 7 . If the claim is true for k, then, since all the centers in the construction of $(X_y)_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+$ are smooth, we may apply the same argument as in Proposition 7 to conclude that

$$(Z_{k+1})_y \cong V_{k+1}$$

hence the claim for $k+1$. This completes the induction.

In particular, we see that the centers $D^{(k)}_{Y,I+}$ of the $k+1$-th step are pairwise disjoint for all $I \subset N$ such that $|I| = n-k-1$: indeed, we have already seen in proposition 4(ii) that the corresponding centers of the $k+1$-th step in the construction of $(X_y)_{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+$ are disjoint, so the result follows from equation (21).

Now, let $\pi_{\mathcal{A}} : X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]^+ \to X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]$ be the full resolution. Also, consider $y \in X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]$ and let y' be the image of y in Y under $X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n] \to Y$. By proposition 7 and equations (20) and (22) we have a cartesian diagram over $y' \to Y$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X^{\mathcal{A}}_{y'}[n]^+ & \longrightarrow & X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n]^+ \\ {\scriptstyle \sigma'_i}\uparrow\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle \sigma_i}\uparrow\downarrow \\ X^{\mathcal{A}}_{y'}[n] & \longrightarrow & X^{\mathcal{A}}_Y[n] \end{array}$$

From the above diagram we see that the fiber of $\pi_{\mathcal{A}} : X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ over y is the fiber of $X_{y'}^{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_{y'}^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ over y, in other words a n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration of $X_{y'}$.

By the above discussion we conclude the following:

Proposition 8. *The morphism $\pi_{\mathcal{A}} : X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ along with the σ_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$ is a universal family of n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations on the fibers of $f : X \to Y$.*

3.2. **Relative weighted stable degenerations.** Let W be a smooth variety and B a smooth curve with a distinguished point $b_0 \in B$. Also, let $\pi : W \to B$ be a flat morphism such that the fibers W_b are smooth for all $b \in B$ except $b = b_0$, in which case W_{b_0} is the union of two smooth varieties X_1 and X_2 intersecting transversally along a smooth divisor D. This implies that $N_{D/X_1} \cong N_{D/X_2}^{\vee}$. Now, let $\mathcal{A} := \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be a set of rational numbers such that $0 < a_i \leq 1$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. In this section we construct a compactification $W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n]$ of the configuration space of n labeled points in $W \to B$ equipped with weights a_i such that

- the points lie in the smooth locus of $W \to B$
- for any set of labels $S \subset N$ of coincident points, we have $\sum_{i \in S} a_i \leq 1$.

First, we recall some preliminary definitions and results from [AF13].

Definition 10. *([ACFW11, Definition 2.3.1]) The expansion of length $l \geq 0$ of W_{b_0} is the variety*

$$W(l) := X_1 \bigsqcup_{D = D_1^-} P_1 \bigsqcup_{D_1^+ = D_2^-} \cdots \bigsqcup_{D_{l-1}^+ = D_l^-} P_l \bigsqcup_{D_{l+}^+ = D} X_2$$

where the P_i are isomorphic to the $\mathbb{P}^1$- bundle $\mathbb{P}(N_{D/X_1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_D) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_D \oplus N_{D/X_2})$ and D_j^-, D_j^+ are the zero and infinity sections of P_j respectively. The P_j are called the exceptional components of the expansion.

In [AF13], the authors construct a compactification of the space of n tuples of points on the fibers of π such that the points are not allowed to land in the singular locus, by replacing the critical fibers by expansions. We give the basic definitions and refer the reader to [ibid.] for more details.

Definition 11. [AF13, Definition 1.2.1] *A stable expanded configuration $(\mathcal{W}, \widetilde{\sigma}_i)$ of degree n on $\pi : W \to B$ consists of:*

(1) either a smooth fiber W_b or an expansion of W_{b_0}, which we denote by $\mathcal{W}$
(2) an ordered collection of n smooth points $\widetilde{\sigma}_i \in \mathcal{W}^{sm}$, $i = 1, \dots n$

such that in case $\mathcal{W}$ is an expansion, the following stability condition holds:

- *each exceptional component P_j contains at least one of the $\widetilde{\sigma}_i$.*

There exists a *moduli space of stable expanded configurations of degree* n, denoted by $W_\pi^{[n]}$, which is a smooth scheme by [AF13, Proposition 1.2.5.]. Also, there exisits a universal family $W_\pi^{[n]+} \to W_\pi^{[n]}$ together with n sections $s_i : W_\pi^{[n]} \to W_\pi^{[n]+}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. We now give the following:

Definition 12. *An n-pointed relative $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration of $W \to B$ is pair $(\mathcal{W}', \sigma_i')$ such that*

$$W' = \mathcal{W} \bigsqcup_{\mathcal{W}^{sm} \setminus \{\sigma_i\}} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$$

where $(\mathcal{W}, \sigma_i)$ is a stable expanded configuration of degree n and $(\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}, \sigma_i')$ is an n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degeneration of $(\mathcal{W}^{sm}, \sigma_i)$ in the sense of section 2.2.

We now construct the compactification of the configuration space described in the beginning of this section whose degenerate objects are the n-pointed relative $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations of $W \to B$. The resulting space is obtained from the moduli space of expanded configurations of degree n [AF13], after pulling apart the sections as dictated by the weight data $\mathcal{A}$.

Let $W_\pi^{[n]}$ be the moduli space of stable expanded configurations. Since the sections $s_i : W_\pi^{[n]} \to W_\pi^{[n]+}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ land in the relative smooth locus, $W_\pi^{[n]+,o}$, of $W_\pi^{[n]+} \to W_\pi^{[n]}$, we get n morphisms $W_\pi^{[n]} \to W_\pi^{[n]+,o}$. For ease of notation set $X := W_\pi^{[n]+,o}$ and $Y := W_\pi^{[n]}$. Then, we have a morphism $Y \to X_Y^n$ induced by the n sections and a natural morphism $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \to X_Y^n$, where $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is the relative weighted compactification defined in section 3.1. Define $W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n]$ to be the fiber product :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n] & \longrightarrow & X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Y & \longrightarrow & X_Y^n \end{array}$$

and let $W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n]^+$ be the fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ & \longrightarrow & X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \\ {\scriptstyle \sigma_i'}\uparrow\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle \sigma_i}\uparrow\downarrow \\ W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n] & \longrightarrow & X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n] \end{array}$$

where the sections σ_i' are pullbacks of the sections σ_i.

By Propositions 7 and 8, we see that $X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to X_Y^{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is a 'universal family' of the n-pointed $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations on the fibers of $W_\pi^{[n]+,o} \to W_\pi^{[n]}$, so we conclude:

Proposition 9. *The morphism $W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n]^+ \to W_{\pi,\mathcal{A}}[n]$ along with the sections σ_i' is a 'universal family' of n-pointed relative $\mathcal{A}$ stable degenerations of $W \to B$.*

4. Examples of weighted compactifications

4.1. **Weighted stable maps of degree one to $\mathbb{P}^1$.** In [MM07] the authors construct intermediate moduli spaces for the space of genus 0 stable maps to projective space. In the case when the degree is 1 and the target is $\mathbb{P}^1$, the following definition is given:

Definition 13. [MM07, Definition 1.7]*Let k, n be integers such that $0 \leq k \leq n$. Consider a morphism $\phi : C \to S \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of degree 1 over each geometric fiber C_s with $s \in S$ and n marked sections of $C \to S$. The morphism will be called k- stable if the following conditions are satisfied for all $s \in S$:*

- *not more than $n-k$ of the marked points in C_s coincide;*
- *any end irreducible component of C_s, i.e. one that corresponds to a vertex of valence 1 in the dual graph of the curve, besides the parametrized one contains more than $n-k$ marked points ;*
- *all marked sections lie in the relative smooth locus ;*
- *C_s has no non-trivial automorphisms fixing the points and the map to $\mathbb{P}^1$.*

Such morphisms are also called *k stable parametrized rational pointed curves.* The above moduli problem is finely represented by a scheme:

Proposition 10. *(*[MM07, Proposition 1.8]*) For each k such that $0 \leq k \leq n$, let $\mathbb{P}^1[n,k]$ be the closure of the diagonal embedding*

$$(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \setminus \bigcup_{i,j} \Delta_{i,j} \to (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{|S|>n-k} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^S$$

where $S \subset N = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $|S| > 2$. The moduli problem of k stable parametrized rational pointed curves is finely represented by $\mathbb{P}^1[n,k]$.

The moduli space $\mathbb{P}^1[n,k]$ is a weighted compactification. Indeed, take any rational number ϵ such that $\frac{1}{n-k+1} < \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{n-k}$ and consider the ordered set $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon := \{\underbrace{\epsilon, \epsilon, \ldots, \epsilon}_{n \text{ elements}}\}$.

Then, the corresponding building set (section 2.2) is

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon} = \{\Delta_{12\ldots n}; \Delta_{12\ldots(n-1)}, \ldots, \Delta_{23\ldots n}; \ldots; \Delta_{12\ldots n-k+1}, \ldots, \Delta_{k(k+1)\ldots n}\},$$

i.e. $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}$ is the set of all diagonals of size greater than $n-k$ listed in ascending dimension order. By Definition 5, the weighted compactification, $X_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}[n]$, of $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} \Delta_S$ is the closure of the diagonal embedding

$$i : (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} \Delta_S \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^n$$

Since the formation of blowups commutes with smooth base change, we have $Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \cong (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times_{(\mathbb{P}^1)^S} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^S \cong (\mathbb{P}^1)^{N\setminus S} \times Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^S$. We now see that $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^S$

may be realized as a closed subscheme of

$$(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^n = (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} (\mathbb{P}^1)^{N\setminus S} \times \prod_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^S,$$

via the graph of the morphism $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \to (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} (\mathbb{P}^1)^{N\setminus S}$, through which i factors . Therefore the closure of i is the same as the closure of the embedding $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} \Delta_S \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^S$. Now, since $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}$ if and only if $|S| > n-k$ and $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \setminus \bigcup_{i,j} \Delta_{i,j}$ is an open subscheme of $(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \setminus \bigcup_{\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}} \Delta_S \subset (\mathbb{P}^1)^n$, we conclude that the closure of the embedding

$$(\mathbb{P}^1)^n \setminus \bigcup_{i,j} \Delta_{i,j} \to (\mathbb{P}^1)^n \times \prod_{|S|>n-k} Bl_{\Delta_S}(\mathbb{P}^1)^S$$

in Proposition 10 is the same as the closure of the image of i, that is

$$\mathbb{P}^1[n,k] \cong X_{\mathcal{A}_\epsilon}[n]$$

5. The Chow ring of the weighted compactification

Let X be a nonsingular variety over an algebraically closed field k. We express the Chow ring of the weighted compactification $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ as an algebra over the Chow ring of X^n. In [Rou14] we use the results of this section to compute the Chow ring of Hassett's space in genus 0 [Has03]. In general, the Chow ring of the product X^n can be hard to compute in terms of the Chow ring of X. For the remainder of this section we will assume that X has a *cellular decomposition*, i.e. there exists a filtration

$$X_n := X \supset X_{n-1} \supset \dots X_0 \supset X_{-1} := \emptyset$$

such that each $X_i \setminus X_{i-1}$ is isomorphic to a disjoint union of affine spaces. The reason we make this assumption is that in this case there exists a natural isomorphism $A^\bullet(X^n) \cong (A^\bullet X)^{\otimes n}$.

To arrive at our result we need some preliminary notions and lemmas. Let Y, Z be smooth varieties such that Z is a codimension d subvariety of Y, for some $d > 0$. Assume, furthermore, that the restriction map of Chow rings $A^\bullet Y \to A^\bullet Z$ is surjective. Denote the kernel of the above map by $J_{Z/Y}$. With these assumptions, we have the following:

Definition 14. *A Chern polynomial for $Z \subset Y$, denoted by $P_{Z/Y}$, is a polynomial*

$$P_{Z/Y} = t^d + a_1 t^{d-1} + \cdots + a_{d-1}t + a_d \in (A^\bullet Y)[t]$$

where $a_i \in A^i Y$ is a class restricting to $c_i(N_{Z/Y})$, the i-th Chern class of the normal bundle of Z in Y. We further require that $a_d = [Z]$, the class of Z in $A^\bullet Y$.

Note that Chern polynomials for $Z \subset Y$ are not unique. The fact that $A^\bullet Y \to A^\bullet Z$ is surjective guarantees the existence of a Chern polynomial for $Z \subset Y$.

For our computations we will need a few lemmas:

Lemma 3. [FM94, Lemma 5.1 (b)] *Let V and W be subvarieties of Y meeting transversally in a variety Z. Suppose that V and W have Chern polynomials $P_{V/Y}(t)$ and $P_{W/Y}(t)$ respectively. Then Z has a Chern polynomial*

$$P_{Z/Y}(t) = P_{V/Y}(t) \cdot P_{W/Y}(t)$$

Let $\pi : \widetilde{Y} \to Y$ be the blowup of Y along Z. We identify $A^\bullet Y$ as a subring of $A^\bullet \widetilde{Y}$ via $\pi^* : A^\bullet Y \to A^\bullet \widetilde{Y}$. Let E denote the exceptional divisor. Then, we have the following:

Lemma 4. [FM94, Lemma 5.2] *Let V be a smooth subvariety of Y that is not contained in Z. Suppose there exists a Chern polynomial $P_{V/Y}(t)$ for $V \subset Y$. Then:*

(1) If V meets Z transversally, then $P_{V/Y}(t)$ is a Chern polynomial for $\widetilde{V} \subset \widetilde{Y}$.
(2) If V contains Z, then $P_{V/Y}(t - E)$ is a Chern polynomial for $\widetilde{V} \subset \widetilde{Y}$

Next, we have the following key formula due to Keel:

Lemma 5. [Kee92] *With the above assumptions and notation, the Chow ring of $\widetilde{Y}$ is given by*

$$A^\bullet \widetilde{Y} = \frac{A^\bullet Y[E]}{(J_{Z/Y} \cdot E, P_{Z/Y}(-E))}$$

Finally, we record two more lemmas that allow us to compute Chow rings of blowups, again under the same hypotheses and notation as above.

Lemma 6. [FM94, Lemma 5.4] *Suppose that V is a nonsingular subvariety of Y that intersects Z transversally in a irreducible subvariety $V \cap Z$ and that the restriction $A^\bullet V \to A^\bullet(V \cap Z)$ is surjective. Let $\widetilde{V} = Bl_Z V$. Then $A^\bullet \widetilde{Y} \to A^\bullet \widetilde{V}$ is surjective with kernel $J_{V/Y}$, if $V \cap Z$ is nonempty and kernel $(J_{V/Y}, E)$, if $V \cap Z$ is empty.*

Lemma 7. [FM94, Lemma 5.5] *Suppose that Z is the transversal intersection of nonsingular varieties V and W of Y and that the restrictions $A^\bullet Y \to A^\bullet V$ and $A^\bullet Y \to A^\bullet W$ are also surjective. Then, $A^\bullet \widetilde{Y} \to A^\bullet \widetilde{V}$ is surjective with kernel $(J_{V/Y}, P_{W/Y}(-E))$.*

Now, let $S \subset N$ such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. The restriction morphism $A^\bullet X^n \to A^\bullet \Delta_S$ is surjective. Define

$$J_S := ker(A^\bullet X^n \to A^\bullet \Delta_S)$$

By our assumptions, X^n has a Künneth decomposition, so we have

$$J_S = (p_a^* x - p_b^* x)_{x \in A^\bullet X,\, a,b \in S}$$

where $p_a : X^n \to X$ is the projection onto the a-th factor. Also, define the polynomial $c_{a,b}(t) \in A^\bullet(X^n)[t]$ by

$$c_{a,b}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^i p_a^*(c_{m-i}) t^i + [\Delta_{\{a,b\}}]$$

where $m = dim(X)$ and c_{m-i} is the $(m-i)$th Chern class of the tangent bundle T_X of X. Finally, we have the following:

Definition 15. *(1) Let $S, T \subset N$ such that $|S|, |T| \geq 2$. We say that S and T **overlap** if S and T have nonempty intersection and neither of them is contained in the other. In this case we also say that T is an **overlap** of S and vice versa.*

*(2) Let $S, T \subset N$ such that $|S|, |T| \geq 2$. We say that T is a **weak overlap** of S (and vice versa) if the intersection of S and T is a singleton.*

Remark: In the above definition we do not require Δ_S or Δ_T to be in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

We are now ready to state and prove the main result of this section: let $A^\bullet(X^n)[D^S]$ be the polynomial ring over $A^\bullet(X^n)$ in the variables D^S, where $S \subset N$ is such that $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. This polynomial ring maps to the Chow ring of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ by sending each D^S to the class of the divisor D_S of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$.

Theorem 8. *With the above assumptions and notation, the Chow ring of $X_{\mathcal{A}}[n]$ is the quotient*

$$\frac{A^\bullet(X^n)[D^S]}{\mathcal{I}}$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is the ideal generated by the following elements:

- *$D^S \cdot D^T$, for any S and T that overlap and both Δ_S and Δ_T belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$;*
- *$J_S \cdot D^S$, where $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$;*
- *$D^S \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{|T|-1} c_{i_k, i_{k+1}} \left(\sum_{I \supseteq S \cup T} D^I \right)$, where $T = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{|T|}\}$ is a weak overlap of S, $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and Δ_T is not necessarily in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$;*

- $\prod_{k=1}^{|S|-1} c_{i_k,i_{k+1}} \left(\sum_{I \supseteq S} D^I \right)$, *where* $S = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{|S|}\}$ *and* $\Delta_S \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

To prove the above theorem, we will successively apply Keel's formula (Lemma 5) to the blowups along the centers of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular, we will need to know how the quantities J_S and P_{Δ_I/X^n} change under the various blowups. We use the notation of Proposition 1 to describe what happens in the intermediate steps:
We extend the partial order of the set of indices of the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to a total order which respects inclusions of diagonals:

$$I_0 := (12 \dots n) < I_1 < \dots < I_{|\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}|-1}$$

Define $X_0 := Bl_{\Delta_{I_0}} X^n$ and let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_0)} := \{{\Delta_{I_0}}^{(I_0)}, {\Delta_{I_1}}^{(I_0)}, \dots {\Delta_{I_l}}^{(I_0)}, \dots, {\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_0)}, \dots\}$ be the set of dominant transforms of the varieties(diagonals) that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in X_0. Then define $X_1 := Bl_{{\Delta_{I_1}}^{(I_0)}} X_0$ and let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_1)} := \{{\Delta_{I_0}}^{(I_1)}, {\Delta_{I_1}}^{(I_1)} \dots {\Delta_{I_l}}^{(I_1)}, \dots, {\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_1)}, \dots\}$ be the set of dominant transforms of the varieties that belong to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_0)}$ in X_1. For $k \geq 2$, we may define inductively the I_k-th iterated blowup,

$$X_k := Bl_{\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_{k-1})}} X_{k-1} = Bl_{{\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{k-1})}} \dots Bl_{\Delta_{I_0}} X^n$$

and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_k)} := \{{\Delta_{I_0}}^{(I_k)}; \dots {\Delta_{I_l}}^{(I_k)}, \dots, {\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_k)}, \dots\}$ as the set of dominant transforms of the subvarieties of X_{k-1} that are the elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_{k-1})}$. In other words, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_k)} := \{{\Delta_{I_0}}^{(I_k)}, \dots {\Delta_{I_l}}^{(I_k)}, \dots, {\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_k)}, \dots\}$ is the set of the I_k-th iterated dominant transforms of the diagonals of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ in X_k. In general, for any $T \subset N$ such that $|T| \geq 2$ and Δ_T **not necessarily in** $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, we define ${\Delta_T}^{(I_k)}$ to be the iterated dominant transform of Δ_T under $X_k \to X^n$.

We have seen in the proof of Proposition 1 that each $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_k)}$ is a building set. With the above notation we have the following:

Lemma 8. *Let $k > j \geq 0$ such that $I_j \supset I_k$. Consider an overlap T of I_k such that $I_k \cup T = I_j$.*

(1) If $l < j$ and T is a weak overlap, then ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_l)}$ and ${\Delta_T}^{(I_l)}$ intersect transversally and ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_l)} \cap {\Delta_T}^{(I_l)} = {\Delta_{I_j}}^{(I_l)}$.

(2) ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap {\Delta_T}^{(I_j)} = \emptyset$.

Now let $l \geq 0$. Consider the set $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},l}$ of the **first** $l+1$ **elements** of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ with the above order. By Lemma 1, this is a building set. Now let $I \subset N$ such that $|I| \geq 2$ and $I \subsetneq I_l$. We form the set $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},l} := \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},l} \cup \{\Delta_I\}$ and equip its set of indices with an order that extends the above total order of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and respects inclusions of diagonals, i.e.

$$I_0 := (12 \dots n) < I_1 < \dots < I_l < I$$

We can see that

Lemma 9. *The set* $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},l} := \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},l} \cup \{\Delta_I\}$ *is a building set.*

Proof: The proof is almost identical to the proof of Lemma 1, so we omit it. □

Also, as above, the set of iterated dominant transforms

$$\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},l}{}^{(I_k)} := \{\Delta_{I_0}{}^{(I_k)}, \dots \Delta_{I_l}{}^{(I_k)}, \Delta_I{}^{(I_k)}\}$$

of the diagonals of $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},l}$ in X_k is a building set when $I_k \leq I$.

Proof of Lemma 8:(1) We keep the above notation and prove the statement by induction. When $j = 0$, the proof is immediate. Assume the statement is true for j. Let $l < j + 1 < k$ and consider a weak overlap T of I_k such that $I_k \cup T = I_{j+1}$. We have seen above that the set $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(I_{l-1})}$ of iterated dominant transforms of the diagonals in X_{l-1} is a building set and that its elements either contain or intersect transversally with the center $\Delta_{I_l}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$. Using this, we distinguish the following cases:

(i) If $I_{j+1} \subsetneq I_l$, then $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ (and consequently each of the $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and $\Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})}$) contains $\Delta_{I_l}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$. Since $l - 1 < j$, we have that $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and $\Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ intersect transversally and $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})} \cap \Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})} = \Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$. Then, by Lemma 2(3)(a), we conclude that $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_l)}$ and $\Delta_T{}^{(I_l)}$ intersect transversally and $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_l)} \cap \Delta_T{}^{(I_l)} = \Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_l)}$, hence the statement for $j + 1$.

(ii) If $I_{j+1} \not\subset I_l$, then $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ cannot contain the center so it has to be transversal to it. Also, we have seen (see discussion after lemma 9) that the set $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j+1} := \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},j+1} \cup \{\Delta_T\}$ is a building set (with order described above), where $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},j+1}$ is the set of the first $j + 2$ elements of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$. We have also seen that the set of the iterated dominant transforms $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j+1}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ in X_k of the diagonals that belong to $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j+1}$ is also a building set with the order described above. Then, since the order respects inclusions of diagonals, the center $\Delta_{I_l}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ is minimal, so, by [Li09, Lemma 2.6(i)], we conclude that $\Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ either contains the center or is transversal to it. Similarly, we can show that $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ also has this property. All possible intersections of $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and $\Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ with the center are then described as follows:

- Both $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and $\Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ are transversal to the center $\Delta_{I_l}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$. Now, since $l - 1 < j$, we have that $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and $\Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})}$ intersect transversally and $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_{l-1})} \cap \Delta_T{}^{(I_{l-1})} = \Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_{l-1})}$. Therefore, by Lemma 2(3)(b), we have that $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_l)}$ and $\Delta_T{}^{(I_l)}$ intersect transversally and $\Delta_{I_k}{}^{(I_l)} \cap \Delta_T{}^{(I_l)} = \Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_l)}$, hence the statement for $j + 1$.

- One of the ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and ${\Delta_T}^{(I_{l-1})}$ contains the center and the other is transversal to it. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{l-1})} \supset {\Delta_{I_l}}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and ${\Delta_T}^{(I_{l-1})}$ is transversal to ${\Delta_{I_l}}^{(I_{l-1})}$. Since $l-1 < j$, we have that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{l-1})}$ and ${\Delta_T}^{(I_{l-1})}$ intersect transversally and ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{l-1})} \cap {\Delta_T}^{(I_{l-1})} = {\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{l-1})}$. Then, by Lemma 2(3)(c), we have that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_l)}$ and ${\Delta_T}^{(I_l)}$ intersect transversally and ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_l)} \cap {\Delta_T}^{(I_l)} = {\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_l)}$, hence the statement for $j+1$.

(2) Take a weak overlap $T' \subset T$ of I_k such that $I_j = I_k \cup T'$. It suffices to show that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap {\Delta_{T'}}^{(I_j)} = \emptyset$. By part (1), we have that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{j-1})}$ and ${\Delta_{T'}}^{(I_{j-1})}$ intersect transversally and ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{j-1})} \cap {\Delta_{T'}}^{(I_{j-1})} = {\Delta_{I_j}}^{(I_{j-1})}$. Using Lemma 2(2), we conclude the result. □

The main step in the proof of Theorem 8 is the following:

Proposition 11. *With notation as above:*

(i) Let $I \subset N$ such that $|I| \geq 2$ and either $\Delta_I \in \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$ or $I \subsetneq I_j$; in the second case Δ_I need not necessarily be an element of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$. Then

$$P_{{\Delta_I}^{(I_j)}/X_j}(t) = P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(t - \sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I_j}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)})$$

(ii) Let $j \geq 0$. For each k such that $I_k > I_j$ (with the order of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$ described above), the restriction $A^\bullet X_j \to A^\bullet \Delta_{I_k}^{(I_j)}$ is surjective with kernel $J_{I_k}^{(j)}$ generated by

- *J_{I_k};*
- *$\Delta_{I_m}^{(I_j)}$, for all I_m that overlap with I_k such that $I_m \leq I_j$;*
- *$P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I \cup I_k}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)})$, for all weak overlaps I of I_k such that $I \cup I_k \leq I_j$.*

Remark: In the third bullet of (2), $\Delta_{I \cup I_k} \in \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$, since $I_k \cup I$ contains I_k, so $I \cup I_k \leq I_j$ makes sense.

Proof:(1) Let $j \geq 0$ and consider $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j} := \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},j} \cup \{\Delta_I\}$, where, as above, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},j}$ is the set of the first $j+1$ elements of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$. The assumption of the Proposition on I is equivalent to saying that $I_j < I$ with respect to the order of $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j}$ described above. We proceed by induction on j. When $j = 0$ the statement reads $P_{{\Delta_I}^{(I_0)}/X_0}(t) = P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(t - \Delta_{I_0}^{(I_0)})$. By the hypothesis $I \subsetneq I_0 := (12\ldots n)$, so $\Delta_I \supsetneq \Delta_{I_0}$, hence the result follows from Lemma 4(2).

Now, we assume that the statement is true for j. We want to prove the statement for $j+1$. Let $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j+1} = \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},j+1} \cup \{\Delta_I\}$ where $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},j+1}$ is the set of the first $j+1$ elements of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$. As noted above, the condition of the proposition for $j+1$ is equivalent to $I_{j+1} < I$

(therefore $I_j < I$). Now the statement for j reads

$$P_{\Delta_I^{(I_j)}/X_j}(t) = P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(t - \sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I_j}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)}) \tag{23}$$

We saw above that the set

$$\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j+1}{}^{(I_j)} := \{\Delta_{I_0}{}^{(I_j)}, \dots, \Delta_{I_j}{}^{(I_j)}, \Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_j)}, \Delta_I{}^{(I_j)}\}$$

of the iterated dominant transforms of the varieties that belong to $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j+1}$ is a building set and that the center $\Delta_{I_j+1}{}^{(I_j)}$ is minimal (see proof of Proposition 1). Then, by [Li09, Lemma 2.6(i)] the rest of the varieties in $\mathcal{G}'_{\mathcal{A},j+1}$ either contain or are transversal to $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_j)}$. In particular, if $I \subsetneq I_{j+1}$ then $\Delta_I{}^{(I_j)} \supseteq \Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_j)}$, otherwise $\Delta_I{}^{(I_j)}$ is transversal to $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}{}^{(I_j)}$. Therefore, by Lemma 4 we have

$$P_{\Delta_I^{(I_{j+1})}/X_{j+1}}(t) = \begin{cases} P_{\Delta_I^{(I_j)}/X_j}(t - \Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})}), \text{ if } I \subsetneq I_{j+1} \\ P_{\Delta_I^{(I_j)}/X_j}(t), \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

Now, by (23) and (24) and since the divisors $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)}$ pull back to $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}$ in X_{j+1}, we deduce that

$$P_{\Delta_I^{(I_{j+1})}/X_{j+1}}(t) = \begin{cases} P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(t - \Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})} - \sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I_j}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}), \text{ if } I \subsetneq I_{j+1} \\ P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(t - \sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I_j}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}), \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

in other words

$$P_{\Delta_I^{(I_{j+1})}/X_{j+1}}(t) = P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(t - \sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I_{j+1}}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})})$$

hence the statement for $j+1$ and this completes the induction.

(2) We proceed again by induction: let $j = 0$. For any $k > 0$ (i.e $I_k > I_0$), we have $I_k \subsetneq I_0 := (12 \dots n)$. Consider a weak overlap I of I_k such that $I_0 = I_k \cup I$. The intersection $\Delta_{I_k} \cap \Delta_I = \Delta_{I_0}$ is transversal, so by Lemma 7, we have that $A^\bullet X_0 \to A^\bullet \Delta_{I_k}^{(I_0)}$ is surjective with kernel $J_{I_k}^{(0)} = (J_{I_k}, P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\Delta_{I_0}^{(I_0)}))$, which is the statement of the proposition for $j = 0$.

Now assume that the statement is true for j and consider any $I_k > I_{j+1}$. We distinguish three cases:

(i) $I_k \subset I_{j+1}$: in this case, $\Delta_{I_k}^{(I_j)}$ contains the center, $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)}$, of the blowup X_{j+1}. Now, let I be any weak overlap of I_k such that $I_{j+1} = I_k \cup I$. By Lemma 8(1), we have ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap {\Delta_I}^{(I_j)} = {\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_j)}$, where the intersection ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap {\Delta_I}^{(I_j)}$ is transversal. Then, by Lemma 7, we see that the restriction $A^\bullet X_{j+1} \to A^\bullet \Delta_{I_k}^{(I_{j+1})}$ is surjective with kernel $J_{I_k}^{(j+1)}$ generated by $J_{I_k}^{(j)}$ and $P_{\Delta_I^{(I_j)}/X_j}(-\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})})$. Since we assumed the claim is true for j and since the divisors $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)}$ and $\Delta_{I_m}^{(I_j)}$ pullback to $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}$ and $\Delta_{I_m}^{(I_{j+1})}$ respectively in X_{j+1}, the contribution from $J_{I_k}^{(j)}$ is:

- J_{I_k};
- $\Delta_{I_m}^{(I_{j+1})}$, for all I_m that overlap with I_k such that $I_m \leq I_j$;
- $P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I \cup I_k}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})})$, for all weak overlaps I of I_k such that $I \cup I_k \leq I_j$.

Also, by part (1) above, we see, since the divisors $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)}$ pull back to the divisors $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}$ in X_{j+1}, that the contribution of $P_{\Delta_I^{(I_j)}/X_j}(-\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})})$ is:

$$P_{\Delta_I^{(I_j)}/X_j}(-\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})}) = P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I_j}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})} - \Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})}) = P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I_{j+1}}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}).$$

The combination of these contributions proves the statement for $j+1$ in case (i).

(ii) I_{j+1} is an overlap of I_k: First, as we have seen above, ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)}$ either contains or intersects transversally with the center of the blowup X_{j+1}, which is $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)}$. Since I_{j+1} is an overlap of I_k, we can eliminate the first case, so ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)}$ must intersect transversally with $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)}$. Also, we can show that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap \Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)} = \emptyset$. Indeed, observe that $I_{j+1} \cup I_k \in \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$ since it contains $I_{j+1} \in \mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}$. Then, we can see that $I_{j+1} \cup I_k \leq I_j$: indeed, since I_{j+1} is an overlap of I_k, we see that $|I_{j+1} \cup I_k| > |I_{j+1}|$, which implies that $I_{j+1} \cup I_k < I_{j+1}$, therefore $I_{j+1} \cup I_k \leq I_j$. In case $I_{j+1} \cup I_k = I_j$, we conclude from Lemma 8(2) that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap \Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)} = \emptyset$. In case $I_{j+1} \cup I_k < I_j$, set $I_{j'} := I_{j+1} \cup I_k$ (note $j' < j$). We may apply Lemma 8(2) again to deduce that ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_{j'})}$ and $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j'})}$ are disjoint, which implies that the strict transforms will still be disjoint after the sequence of blowups $X_j \to X_{j'}$, that is ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap \Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)} = \emptyset$.

We may now apply Lemma 6 to deduce that the restriction $A^\bullet X_{j+1} \to A^\bullet \Delta_{I_k}^{(I_{j+1})}$ is surjective with kernel $J_{I_k}^{(j+1)}$ generated by
(a) $J_{I_k}^{(j)}$ and

(b) the exceptional divisor $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})}$.

Since we assumed the claim is true for j and since the divisors $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)}$ and $\Delta_{I_m}^{(I_j)}$ pullback to $\Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})}$ and $\Delta_{I_m}^{(I_{j+1})}$ respectively in X_{j+1}, the contribution from $J_{I_k}^{(j)}$ is:

- J_{I_k};
- $\Delta_{I_m}^{(I_{j+1})}$, for all I_m that overlap with I_k such that $I_m \leq I_j$;
- $P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I \cup I_k}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_{j+1})})$, for all weak overlaps I of I_k such that $I \cup I_k \leq I_j$.

Observe that there can be no weak overlap I such that $I \cup I_k = I_{j+1}$, so the above contributions combined with the contribution $\Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_{j+1})}$ are precisely those mentioned in the statement of the proposition for $j+1$.

(iii) I_{j+1} is disjoint from I_k: In this case ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cap \Delta_{I_{j+1}}^{(I_j)} \neq \emptyset$ and the result follows from Lemma 6 as above.

□

We now compute the Chow ring of each of the intermediate varieties X_j. Once again, we keep the above notation.

Proposition 12. *Let $j \geq 0$. The Chow ring of X_j is the quotient*

$$\frac{A^\bullet(X^n)[\{{\Delta_{I_i}}^{(I_j)}\}_{i \leq j}]}{\mathcal{I}_j}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_j$ is the ideal generated by the following elements:

- ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cdot {\Delta_{I_l}}^{(I_j)}$ *for any $I_k, I_l \leq I_j$ that overlap;*
- $J_{I_k} \cdot {\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)}$ *for all $I_k \leq I_j$;*
- ${\Delta_{I_k}}^{(I_j)} \cdot P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I \cup I_k}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)})$ *for all $I_k \leq I_j$ and all weak overlaps I of I_k such that $I_k \cup I \leq I_{j-1}$;*
- $P_{\Delta_{I_k}/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I_k \\ I_l \leq I_j}} \Delta_{I_l}^{(I_j)})$ *for all $I_k \leq I_j$.*

Proof: We prove the proposition by induction on j. Let $j = 0$; then, by Lemma 5 the Chow ring of $X_0 = Bl_{\Delta_{I_0}} X^n$ is given by

$$A^\bullet X_0 = \frac{(A^\bullet X^n)[{\Delta_{I_0}}^{(I_0)}]}{(J_{I_0} \cdot {\Delta_{I_0}}^{(I_0)}, P_{\Delta_{I_0}/X^n}(-{\Delta_{I_0}}^{(I_0)}))}$$

which proves the statement of the proposition for $j = 0$.

Now assume that the statement is true for some $j \geq 0$. Again, by Keel's formula (Lemma 5), we conclude that $A^\bullet X_{j+1}$ is the quotient of $(A^\bullet X_j)[{\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})}]$ by the ideal

$$\mathcal{I}_{j+1,j} := (J^{(j)}_{I_{j+1}} \cdot {\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})}, P_{\Delta^{(I_j)}_{I_{j+1}}/X_j}(-{\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})}))$$

Applying Proposition 11 for $k = j + 1$, since the divisors $\Delta^{(I_j)}_{I_l}$ and $\Delta^{(I_j)}_{I_m}$ pullback to $\Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_l}$ and $\Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_m}$ respectively in X_{j+1}, we deduce that the contribution from $J^{(j)}_{I_{j+1}} \cdot {\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})}$ is:

- $J_{I_{j+1}} \cdot {\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})}$;
- $\Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_m} \cdot {\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})}$, for all I_m that overlap with I_{j+1} such that $I_m \leq I_j$;
- ${\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})} \cdot P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I \\ I_l \leq I \cup I_{j+1}}} \Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_l})$, for all weak overlaps I of I_{j+1} such that $I \cup I_{j+1} \leq I_j$.

Also, the contribution from $P_{\Delta^{(I_j)}_{I_{j+1}}/X_j}(-{\Delta_{I_{j+1}}}^{(I_{j+1})}))$ is

$$P_{\Delta_{I_{j+1}}/X^n}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I_{j+1} \\ I_l \leq I_j}} \Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_l} - \Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_{j+1}}) = P_{\Delta_{I_{j+1}/X^n}}(-\sum_{\substack{I_l \supseteq I_{j+1} \\ I_l \leq I_{j+1}}} \Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_l})$$

due to Proposition 11(1) and the fact that the divisors $\Delta^{(I_j)}_{I_l}$ pull back to $\Delta^{(I_{j+1})}_{I_l}$.

All these contributions give the total contribution of $\mathcal{I}_{j+1,j}$ above. Therefore, we see immediately that the total contribution of $\mathcal{I}_{j+1}$, which is the contribution of $\mathcal{I}_{j+1,j}$ along with the contribution of $\mathcal{I}_j$, is precisely the set of relations described in the statement of the proposition for $j + 1$. This completes the induction. □

Now the proof of Theorem 8 is an immediate consequence of the above Proposition for $j = |\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{A}| - 1$ and the following:

Lemma 10. *For any $I \subset N$ such that $|I| \geq 2$, the Chern polynomial $P_{\Delta_I/X^n}(t)$ is equal to the product of Chern polynomials $\prod_{k=1}^{|I|-1} c_{i_k,i_{k+1}}(-t)$, where $I = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{|I|}\}$.*

Proof: We prove this by induction on $|I|$. When $|I| = 2$, the result is immediate. Let $j \geq 3$ and assume the result is true for all $I \subset N$ with $|I| < j$. Then consider a set with j elements $I' := \{i_1, i_2, \dots i_j\}$. Set $J := \{i_1, i_2\}$ and $J' := \{i_2, \dots i_j\}$. Then the intersection $\Delta_J \cap \Delta_{J'} = \Delta_{I'}$ is transversal. By Lemma 3, we have

$$P_{\Delta_{I'}/X^n}(t) = P_{\Delta_J/X^n}(t) \cdot P_{\Delta_{J'}/X^n}(t)$$

which, by the induction hypothesis is equal to

$$c_{i_1,i_2}(-t) \cdot \prod_{k=2}^{j-1} c_{i_k,i_{k+1}}(-t) = \prod_{k=1}^{|I'|-1} c_{i_k,i_{k+1}}(-t)$$

hence the statement for $j+1$. □

References

[ACFW11] D. Abramovich, C. Cadman, B. Fantechi, and J. Wise, *Expanded degenerations and pairs*, October 2011, arXiv:1110.2976.

[ACV03] D. Abramovich, A. Corti, and A. Vistoli, *Twisted bundles and admissible covers*, Communications in Algebra **31** (2003), no. 8, 3547–3618.

[AF13] D. Abramovich and B. Fantechi, *Configurations of points on degenerate varieties and properness of moduli spaces*, 2013.

[AG08] Valery Alexeev and G. Michael Guy, *Moduli of weighted stable maps and their gravitational descendants*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **7** (2008), no. 3, 425–456. MR MR2427420 (2009f:14112)

[BM09] Arend Bayer and Yu. I. Manin, *Stability conditions, wall-crossing and weighted Gromov-Witten invariants*, Mosc. Math. J. **9** (2009), no. 1, 3–32, backmatter. MR MR2567394

[CT] Anna-Maria Castravet and Jenia Tevelev, $\overline{M}_{0,n}$ *is not a Mori dream space.*

[DM69] P. Deligne and D. Mumford, *The irreducibility of the space of curves of given genus*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1969), no. 36, 75–109. MR 0262240 (41 #6850)

[FM94] William Fulton and Robert MacPherson, *A compactification of configuration spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2) **139** (1994), no. 1, 183–225. MR 1259368 (95j:14002)

[GJM13] Noah Giansiracusa, David Jensen, and Han-Bom Moon, *GIT compactifications of* $M_{0,n}$ *and flips*, Adv. Math. **248** (2013), 242–278. MR 3107511

[Has03] Brendan Hassett, *Moduli spaces of weighted pointed stable curves*, Adv. Math. **173** (2003), no. 2, 316–352. MR MR1957831 (2004b:14040)

[HM82] Joe Harris and David Mumford, *On the Kodaira dimension of the moduli space of curves*, Invent. Math. **67** (1982), no. 1, 23–88, With an appendix by William Fulton. MR 664324 (83i:14018)

[Kee92] Sean Keel, *Intersection theory of moduli space of stable n-pointed curves of genus zero*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **330** (1992), no. 2, 545–574. MR 1034665 (92f:14003)

[KKO14] Bumsig Kim, Andrew Kresch, and Yong-Geun Oh, *A compactification of the space of maps from curves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2014), no. 1, 51–74. MR 3118390

[KM76] Finn Faye Knudsen and David Mumford, *The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves. I. Preliminaries on "det" and "Div"*, Math. Scand. **39** (1976), no. 1, 19–55. MR 0437541 (55 #10465)

[KM11] Young-Hoon Kiem and Han-Bom Moon, *Moduli spaces of weighted pointed stable rational curves via GIT*, Osaka J. Math. **48** (2011), no. 4, 1115–1140. MR 2871297 (2012m:14052)

[Knu83a] Finn F. Knudsen, *The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves. II. The stacks* $M_{g,n}$, Math. Scand. **52** (1983), no. 2, 161–199. MR 702953 (85d:14038a)

[Knu83b] ———, *The projectivity of the moduli space of stable curves. III. The line bundles on $M_{g,n}$, and a proof of the projectivity of $\overline{M}_{g,n}$ in characteristic* 0, Math. Scand. **52** (1983), no. 2, 200–212. MR 702954 (85d:14038b)

[Li09] Li Li, *Wonderful compactification of an arrangement of subvarieties*, Michigan Math. J. **58** (2009), no. 2, 535–563. MR 2595553 (2011f:14086)

[MM07] Andrei Mustaţă and Magdalena Anca Mustaţă, *Intermediate moduli spaces of stable maps*, Invent. Math. **167** (2007), no. 1, 47–90. MR 2264804 (2008j:14024)

[Pan95] Rahul Pandharipande, *A geometric invariant theory compactification of $M_{g,n}$ via the Fulton-MacPherson configuration space*, 1995.

[Rou14] Evangelos Routis, *The Chow ring of the moduli space of genus 0 weighted stable curves*, http://www.math.brown.edu/~r0utis/.

Brown University, Department of Mathematics, Box 1917, 151 Thayer Street Providence, RI 02912

E-mail address: r0utis@math.brown.edu